1992

Changing Patterns of Centralization and Decentralization in American School Governance.

Charles Walter Triche III
Louisiana State University and Agricultural & Mechanical College

INFORMATION TO USERS

This manuscript has been reproduced from the microfilm master. UMI films the text directly from the original or copy submitted. Thus, some thesis and dissertation copies are in typewriter face, while others may be from any type of computer printer.

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted. Broken or indistinct print, colored or poor quality illustrations and photographs, print bleedthrough, substandard margins, and improper alignment can adversely affect reproduction.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send UMI a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if unauthorized copyright material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.

Oversize materials (e.g., maps, drawings, charts) are reproduced by sectioning the original, beginning at the upper left-hand corner and continuing from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps. Each original is also photographed in one exposure and is included in reduced form at the back of the book.

Photographs included in the original manuscript have been reproduced xerographically in this copy. Higher quality 6" x 9" black and white photographic prints are available for any photographs or illustrations appearing in this copy for an additional charge. Contact UMI directly to order.

U·M·I

University Microfilms International
A Bell & Howell Information Company
300 North Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346 USA
313/761-4700 800/521-0600

Order Number 9301110

Changing patterns of centralization and decentralization in American school governance

Triche, Charles Walter, III, Ph.D.

The Louisiana State University and Agricultural and Mechanical Col., 1992

U·M·I
300 N. Zeeb Rd.
Ann Arbor, MI 48106

CHANGING PATTERNS OF CENTRALIZATION AND DECENTRALIZATION IN AMERICAN SCHOOL GOVERNANCE

A Dissertation

Submitted to the Graduate Faculty of the
Louisiana State University and
Agricultural and Mechanical College
in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy

in

The Department of Administrative and Foundational Services

by

Charles Walter Triche III
B.S., Louisiana State University, 1970
M.S., Louisiana State University, 1972
May, 1992

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

There have been many individuals who have helped me in the writing of this dissertation. First I would like to thank Dr. Robert O. Slater and Dr. Gary Crow, my co-major professors, for their lively discussion, careful editing, patient advice, enthusiasm and support. To the other members of my committee I owe an extreme debt of gratitude. Drs. Charles Teddlie, Evangeline Mcjamerson and Terry Geske were kind, considerate friends who showed enthusiasm and interest in this project. Very special thanks to Dr. Amos E. Simpson and Dr. H. Vaughan Baker at the University of Southwestern Louisiana, who not only kindly agreed to serve on my dissertation committee, but also helped to shape every facet of this work. I will forever be in their debt. Additionally, I would like to thank the Dean's representative on my committee, Dr. Christopher Kenny for his constructive criticism and interest in the project.

My colleagues at the University of Southwestern Louisiana Library also are in my debt. Barbara Flynn, Head of Reference Services never failed to ferret out that obscure piece of information I always seemed to need, and she did it quickly, willingly and as a true friend. She also very patiently read every single page of this manuscript searching for errors. I sincerely appreciate her efforts. Anna Jane Marks, Interlibrary

Loan Librarian, always dropped what she was doing in an effort to process my oftentimes obscure requests. Dr. Gloria S. Cline as well as the members of the Circulation Services Department deserve special mention. They include Linda A. Desormeaux, Sandra B. Castille, V. Dale Rourke, Ann Keating, Barbara Feinblum, Jenny Roy and Jamie Guidry. Beate Kukainis was very helpful to me in discussing political theory. Additionally, a special thanks to Cyn. D. Reynaud at LSU, she is, indeed, one of a kind. I also owe a debt of gratitude to my cousin, Nina J. Maraist; she kept me laughing through all of this. And lastly, but certainly not least, Dr. Clayton J. Delery, who very carefully read numerous drafts of this work and gave me his support, and Ms. Lucette B. Holland who never failed to lend her enthusiasm, encouragement and support--and maybe that extra push when I needed one.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

Table

ABSTRACT

This dissertation traces the evolution of American school governance and educational administration from the mid-seventeenth century through 1991. It examines the arguments which surround the centralization or decentralization debate and traces the rationale for the adoption of either a centralist or decentralist manner of school governance. In tracing the evolution of the rationale used by educational administrators for the adoption of either a centralist or decentralist form of governance, this dissertation establishes an order to the debate, traces shifts in philosophy, determines the dominance of either centralist or decentralist philosophy during each historical period studied, and identifies reasons why that particular philosophy dominated the era.

CHAPTER 1

Introduction

> The distribution of power among the inhabitants of the earth is subject to a constant whirlwind of change.
> (Boulding, 1990, p. 45)

The acquisition of human power, that is, the ability to get what one wants, turns out to be a complex issue. Power vested in individuals, since the rise of civilization has been more often than not unequally distributed. The distribution of human power, either centralized or decentralized in nature, continues to be a subject of debate (Boulding, 1990, pp. 21-23).

The human race tends to divide into small groups of the powerful and larger groups of the seemingly powerless and indigent. "With the development of science-based technology after about 1850..., we begin to see the rise of the middle class to a majority of the society, with [their] political power limited by democracy, and [the] economic power of progressive taxation..." (Boulding, 1990, p. 21-23).

The terms "centralization" and "decentralization" are most often used when discussing the acquisition and distribution of power. Collectively, they establish the theoretical framework upon which power bases are built and rebuilt. Each philosophical framework relies upon differing power structure relationships.

The centralist philosophy relies on the notion of a type of power distribution known as "hierarchical" power. In a hierarchical relationship, whether governmental, economical, monarchical, or educational, power is given from lower to higher ranks. Acquired power, in this centralized manner of governance, is limited by the knowledge possessed by the members of that structure. Power, then, in a hierarchical, centralized relationship is dependent upon and limited by the knowledge of its members, and this centralized structure cannot survive unless it is legitimized by its lower members. A refusal to legitimate the power structure results in the ultimate denial of hierarchical, centralized power. This refusal frequently culminates in revolution. The American Revolution is a prime example of the refusal to legitimate power, and the eventual revolt against a centralized, hierarchical or monarchical power structure (Boulding, 1990, p, 35-44).

By its very nature, power is not static; it shifts. Boulding (1990) identifies power acquisition as a kaleidoscopic series of shifting patterns. Power shifts from hierarchical (centralized) to distributional (decentralized) and from distributional to hierarchical as attitudes shift and societies evolve. It exists on an ever-changing continuum where the presence of one does not necessarily imply the exclusion of the other.

It is this notion of shifts in centralized and decentralized power, the structure of the relationships within the framework where power distributions exist, and the evolution of its distribution in American school governance and educational administration which guide the organization of this dissertation.

Statement of the Problem

David Tyack (1974), in his interpretive history of nineteenth-century public schools, suggests that as the nation was shaped, so too was American school governance. He states "it is clear that many educators in the past sought the one best system or centralized control of the city schools..." (p. 11-12). His analysis of the development of the public school system during the nineteenth century is a preliminary one, and ties this development to the evolution of United States political ideology and the concept of centralization. He asserts that it was the belief during the nineteenth century that the "one best system" for the governance of schools was a system with centralized control. His five-part work, The One Best System, begins with the development and analysis of the concept of "community control," and concludes with the major changes in urban education at the turn of the century. This analysis ties urban, industrial, and governmental development to that of schools and schooling.

Ostrom (1976) suggests that "human reasoning depends upon words and upon language. The words we use and the relationship we assume by virtue of the words we use determine the thoughts we have, the implications we draw and govern our actions" (Ostrom, 1976, p. 32). To understand more fully those forces that come to bear upon society and governments, with specific reference to the origination of, and development of, centralizing and decentralizing tendencies and patterns, this dissertation explores the 'climate' in which those forces existed. By studying both primary and secondary sources, subtle changes in language will be sought out and examined in search of shifts in supportive rationale for centralist or decentralist philosophies. As the literature is examined, themes will be identified which will shape an interpretation of the patterns of events which served to form American school governance and the evolution of American educational administration.

This dissertation, then, is an intellectual history tracing the evolution of the centralization and decentralization debate since the end of the eighteenth century, and the degree to which that evolution has affected governance in American schools. Its purpose is to examine the arguments surrounding centralization and decentralization of American school governance in the United States during the seventeenth through twentieth centuries, and to trace the rationale for the adoption

of either a centralist or decentralist manner of governance. Tracing the evolution of this rationale establishes an order to the debate, traces shifts in philosophy, determines the dominance of either a centralist or a decentralist philosophy during each period studied, and identifies the reasons why that particular philosophy dominated.

These research questions guide the writing of this dissertation: (1) Throughout United States history when did a centralist philosophy of American school governance dominate and when did a decentralist philosophy dominate? (2) What have been the reasons presented for the adoption of a centralist over decentralist manner of American school governance or a decentralist over a centralist philosophy? (3) What have been the social pressures causing shifts in the dominance of either a centralist or decentralist philosophy in American school governance?

Definition of Terms

By the very nature of this dissertation, definition will play a key role in its formulation. Definitions of key terms will evolve as the history of the changing arguments unfolds. It is useful here, however, to define the following terms:

'Decentralization' - "a process of transferring or 'devolving' power and authority from large to small units of government" (McGinn and Street, 1986, p. 471).

'Centralization' - "[a process] in which a central government holds most or all authority and power" (McGinn and Street, 1986, p. 471).

Significance of the Study

This dissertation expands on the work of David Tyack (1974) and attempts to make "its periodization more precise" (p. 3). It also offers alternative views to Tyack's analysis of nineteenth century American school governance. Where Tyack focused on "public schools in big cities" (Tyack, 1974, p. 8), this work will add the dimension of the rural school network and will focus on the decentralist counter arguments presented. Additionally, it questions Tyack's conclusion that a centralist form of American school governance dominated nineteenth-century American school governance. In doing so, the study attempts to identify the dominating social influences which have led to both centralization and decentralization movements in the evolution of American school governance. Besides expanding on Tyack's (1974) work, this dissertation will turn to the twentieth century and trace the evolution of American school governance throughout this historical

period. "...Organizations shape and are shaped by the larger social system, they also ... have a life of their own which influences the behavior of their members" (Tyack, 1974, p. 9). By adding the analysis of the evolution of rural American school governance to that of urban American school governance, this dissertation will fill the need suggested by Tyack (1974) when he wrote that an "analysis ... can offer a way to ask questions about the whole society while retaining a particular institutional focus" (p. 9).

Additionally this study can shed new light on the evolution of the current school restructuring effort as it points to those rationales which were and were not successful as reformers restructured American schools and educational administration. Concepts such as site-based management, school based management, school councils and schools of choice are not as innovative as they are touted to be. Many of these reform efforts have been tried in the past with only marginal success. This study should inform policy makers by reviewing the history of that which was and was not successful.

Limitations of the Study

Writing an intellectual history poses some significant problems; hence, inherent in this process are definite limitations. One primary limitation to this study is the problem of the method for the writing

of a history of ideas. "The most basic problem for historians of ideas ... [is] ... that of taking ideas seriously and describing them precisely without losing sight of their environmental relationship" (Skotheim, 1966, p. viii). Interweaving American school governance history with that of the American national government helps to facilitate an analysis which considers not only that which was occurring within the educational community but also highlights those external forces which came to bear on educational governance as it evolved.

Another limitation is that this dissertation is being written from the viewpoint of present-day knowledge and, as Robert Skotheim suggests, may "reflect the 'climate of opinion' in which [it] is being written" (Skotheim, 1966, p. viii). This study, therefore, limits itself to period, contemporary scholarship rather than modern. By limiting largely to this type of primary source material, any clouding of the data by prior interpretation may be reduced and any biasing of the data by reflecting the climate of today's opinion might, therefore, be minimized.

General Outline of the Dissertation

This eight-chapter analysis of the concepts of centralization and decentralization follows the traditionally accepted periods in American history.

Each section is written following the same organizational framework. The historical period to be studied is introduced. Next the centralist and decentralist debate surrounding American school governance is examined. Each chapter then concludes with a comparison and contrast analysis of the pro and con arguments surrounding the centralization versus decentralization debate, and points to those forces which influenced the dominance of one philosophy over the other.

The American Colonial Period highlights centralist and decentralist philosophies as the United States government and colonial American school governance evolve from approximately 1642 to 1790: this period forms the basis for the first section of this work. The analysis of the evolution of American school governance and educational administration begins with the "Old Deluder Satan Act" and traces the development of public school education to the beginning of the Federalist Period. Incorporated into this section is a discussion of the development of the public school system, coupled with a parallel analysis of the development and formation of the United States Federal Government. Centralist and decentralist arguments and the place of American school governance in the dominance of one philosophy over the other are traced. The dominant

philosophy is identified and the reasons for that dominance discussed.

The centralization versus decentralization debate continues with the beginning of the Federalist Period, approximately 1790, and concludes in 1865 with the end of the United States Civil War and the beginning of Reconstruction. The impact of the War of 1812 and the Civil War is used as impetus for an analysis of subtle but significant changes in the centralization and decentralization debate, as American school governance shifts. This second chapter reviews the reasons given for a seeming shift from decentralization to centralization in American school governance.

The year 1865 marks the beginning of a critical period in the evolution of the United States' development as a union of states. This third chapter begins with Reconstruction, and concludes with the end of that period and the beginning of World War I. The impact of the reconstruction of the Southern States, the industrial revolution and the Spanish American War are used as a basis for an analysis of the centralization versus decentralization debate. It identifies the alternative reasons society presented for the same decentralist argument and reviews those forces which altered these reasons. It reviews the reasons given for a shift from decentralization to centralization in big

city school systems, and examines rural American school systems and discusses their decentralist attitudes.

New, significant technological developments highlight the analyses of the fourth section of the dissertation. This chapter begins with 1914 and the beginning of World War I. It concludes with the beginning of the Second World War, discussing the manner in which such forces as the mass-production of new transportation technologies, specifically the automobile and the school bus, and the development of and improvement of mass-communication technologies significantly changed the arguments for both centralist and decentralist advocates. This chapter carries the evolution of American school governance through the Great Stock Market crash of 1929, and analyzes world forces which came to bear as this governance evolved. The rise and fall of charismatic world leaders and totalitarian dictatorships surround the centralization/decentralization debate. This chapter examines reasons presented for centralizing or decentralizing and concludes with the impact of the beginning of the Second World War.

The contemporary period is the subject of the fifth chapter. It begins with the start of World War II and carries the debate to approximately 1980, with particular attention to the crucial decade of the 1950s. Significant technological advances, particularly

Sputnik, and international governmental competition with the Soviet Union, force reassessments in American education. Governmental competition played a key role in educational development during this time. The reasons touted in the centralization and decentralization debate changed during this time and played a significant role in the assumption of a more centralist attitude.

The decades of the 1960s and 1970s mark an era when centralist philosophies dominated business and industry, governing and governance, and schools and schooling. It is during this era in American history that the United States Federal Government exhibited a strong centralist philosophy, exemplified by the Great Society of the Lyndon B. Johnson administration and the proliferation of education and civil rights legislation. The language of the centralization and the decentralization debates assume a new flavor and significantly influenced American culture, society, and school governance.

The decentralist concept of the 'New Federalism' which is an outgrowth of the decade of the 1980s and continues into the decade of the 1990s, forms the basis for the next chapter. What does the language of centralist and decentralist philosophers reveal? To what extent do these arguments reflect, through linguistic analysis, the language of earlier centralization and decentralization proponents?

The final chapter incorporates a summary analysis of the centralization/decentralization debate. This analysis studies the reasons given for both centralization and decentralization as these reasons have evolved over time. It points to the structure of the arguments and notes where the position remained the same while the reasons for that position shifted, and it reviews the place of American school governance within this structure.

Methodology

A comprehensive bibliography was collected for the literature surrounding the concepts of both centralization and decentralization. This bibliography covers the literature which has appeared from the late eighteenth century through both the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. Citations range from approximately 1780 through 1991. Sources used in the collection of these data include but are not limited to: Reader's Guide to Periodical Literature, Poole's Index to Periodical Literature, ABC PolSci Index, Index to U. S. Government Periodicals, Monthly Catalog of United States Government Publications, Education Index, Current Index to Journals In Education, Historical Abstracts, Subject Guide to Books in Print, Index to Legal Periodicals, Dissertation Abstracts International, Library of Congress Catalog: Books: Subjects, and America: History

and Life. In addition to these traditional sources for gathering bibliographic citations, several computerized data bases have been consulted. These data bases include Wilsonline, ERIC, and Infotrak. [See Appendix A for citation analysis for each index or data base.]

After these citations were collected, each was entered into a computer, using programs written to manipulate the bibliographic data. As entries were recorded each was assigned a subject heading or headings (as appropriate). These headings were derived from two basic methods: (1) Key words in context, that is, those key words in the title of the citation or from an analysis of the source content and (2) Subject headings by assignment. Programs were written which sort these data by type of literature represented (either decentralization or centralization), kind of literature (book, periodical or dissertation), the year written, and/or subject headings involved. [See Appendix B for examples of sorting programs and output from those programs.]

After the bibliographic citations were sorted by year, they were grouped according to recognized major historical periods. At this point, representative citations were reviewed, and, eventually, all citations for the historical period were examined. Methodologies for both traditional historical analysis and currently accepted qualitative methodologies were merged, and a

comparison was made between that which was found through an historical interpretation of the literature, and the dominant "emerging themes" which revealed themselves through a qualitative analysis of the subject and key word recurrences.

After all these 3300 entries were made, sorts by year and by subject/key word were conducted. By sorting these ways, the two methods of data analysis could be completed. First, the chronological sort allowed for the development and organization of the historical analysis and provided the framework for an evolutionary analysis of the centralist/decentralist debate within the respective historical periods. Second, the subject/key word sort allowed for verification of the recurring emerging themes in the debate and for a comparison and contrast analysis of the changing reasons given by both centralization and decentralization proponents.

The primary methodological tool used in the analysis of the dominance of either a centralist or decentralist philosophy of American school governance, as well as for a determination of the reasons presented for either centralizing or decentralizing, is that of content analysis. Borg and Gall (1983) point to Bernard Berelson's assertion that content analysis is an effective "research technique for the objective, systematic, and quantitative description of the manifest

content of communication" (Borg and Gall, 1983, P. 511).

This method of analysis proves most appropriate because the history of the ideas of centralization and decentralization will provide the descriptive information for an analysis of the dominance of one philosophy over the other, and the reasons for that dominance. Cross-validation occurred as the emerging themes from the intellectual history unfolded, coupled with the emerging themes which evolved from the content analysis of the key word/subject headings produced for the collected bibliographic citations. The similarity of these findings with those of the history itself are highlighted as representative sample citation titles are pointed to as a comparison analysis.

CHAPTER 2

Colonial Development and an Evolving American School Governance

> Everything which has power to win the obedience and respect of men must have its roots deep in the past.
> (Bryce in Martin, 1894, p. 44)

The concept of a centralized or decentralized method of government played a key role in the development of the United States of America. From its founding, through the evolution of its constitution, to its present day method of governance, the American states were constantly concerned with individual and group interests, social cleavages, interstate conflicts and other similar problems which have to be dealt with in the creation, evolution, and development of a government acceptable to the majority of people. At issue in the organization of the government, from its founding, was the notion of who was to maintain control, exercise governance, wield power, and exert domination and authority over the colonies which were to evolve into the United States of America. Early records demonstrate the manner and reasons why specific methods of governance evolved. For example, "in the fourth year from the settlement of Boston, at which time the earliest extant records were made, three persons were chosen to [manage the affairs of the town]" (Palfrey,

1859, p. 381). In a similar move, the inhabitants of Charlestown elected 'Selectmen,' to manage their town. On February 10, 1634, the freemen of Charlestown voted that centralized power and authority were to be divided among eleven "chosen" men. The order reads:

> In consideration of the great trouble and charge of the inhabitants of Charlestown by reason of the frequent meeting of the townsmen in general, and that, by reason of many men meeting, things were not so easily brought into a joint issue; it is therefore agreed by the said townsmen jointly, that these eleven men whose names are written on the other side (with the advice of pastor and teacher desired in any case of conscience) shall entreat of all such business as shall concern the townsmen, the choice of officers excepted, and what they or the greater part of them shall conclude of, the rest of the town willingly to submit unto as their own proper act, and these eleven to continue in this employment for one year ...
> (Palfrey, 1859, vol. 1, pp. 381-382).

As a natural evolution in United States national governance, centralized forms of local, town, city, territorial, and state management occurred as the population of a locale grew. Very early on in United States history attempts at unification, hence consolidation or centralization, were attempted. As we shall see, plans for the consolidation of efforts and services were not limited to forms of local political governance but affected educational services as well.

Early Attempts at Confederation: "Consociation"

Frost (1852) reports that the population of the colonies continued to grow so that by 1640 they had an estimated population of 27,947 (Carruth, 1972, p. 16) and by 1701 that population had reached 262,000 inhabitants. The population continued to explode during the next forty-six years, for by 1747 there were 986,000 inhabitants (p. 446). The colonies were growing at a startling rate. Colonists began to feel that they were losing control over their territories. They, therefore, began to call for a type of consolidation which they termed "consociation." The first example of a unification of colonies appears in a scheme for forming a confederation of the "four principal Colonies of New England" in the early 1640s (Palfrey, 1859, vol. 1, p. 623). These four principal colonies were "the United Colonies of New England ... Massachusetts Bay, Plymouth, Connecticut, and New Haven" (Ketz, ed., 1976, Vol. 2, p. 121).

This confederation, therefore, offers the first example of an attempt at unification in colonial history. The logic behind the formation of this confederacy was the inhabitants' belief that it was their immediate duty to enter into a consociation amongst themselves. The rationale guiding this "consociation" was an expressed need "for mutual help and strength in all [their] future concernments...."

(Palfrey, 1859, Vol. 1, pp. 623-624). The confederation conceived primarily for economic and trading purposes served to highlight the advantages of unification.

What is significant about this early attempt at the formation of a centralized government is that it marks the first time that the New England Colonies "had taken their affairs into their own hands" (Palfrey, 1859, Vol. 1, p. 634). Additionally, it is interesting to note that the terms used for the unification, consolidation or centralization of power were "consociation" and "operation in concert," and that the chief reasons given for this "consociation" were those of "mutual help and strength in all ... future concernments; that, as in nation and religion, so in other respects, we be and continue one" (Palfrey, 1859, Vol. 1, p. 624). Other early attempts at the formation of a confederation consistently failed. However, from the original "consociation" of the "four principal colonies" in 1643, through the "Articles of Confederation and Perpetual Union" in 1787, moves to confederate repeatedly occurred. Each movement held the hope of compromise and success, but all movements toward unification fell short of their anticipated goals. This is because each legal unit which sought to enter into a contract of unification also sought to retain individual autonomy and, therefore relinquished to the proposed "union" as little of its powers as possible. Most colonists were

concerned with their individual, decentralized retention of control. That concern, however, eventually led to an attempt at consolidation, the failure of which, ironically, would serve as the catalyst for an extraordinarily successful unification effort.

The Evolution of a Federalist Government

The "Articles of Confederation and Perpetual Union," entered in Congress on July 8, 1788, represent in American governmental history a grand experimental failure. They are significant because nothing like them had existed since the fall of the Roman Republic. The notion of the creation of such a drastically changed government represents an innovative approach to governance. Inhabitants of individual states were intensely loyal to their states. At issue was the kind of central government that "was to replace British rule... [and this replacement] was as vital an issue as independence itself" (Jensen, 1948, p. xii). Arguments abounded as to the degree of centralist versus non-centralist government. Forces and arguments reduced the problems for governmental formation to two ideas --"the central government and the state government. The basic problems involved were ... the division of powers between the central and local governments ... and ... the location of sovereignty, of ultimate political authority" (Jensen, 1948, p. xiv).

The "Articles" which were developed embodied the ideal of self-government. They have been sharply criticized by Hale (1826) as being the product of a young nation lacking both the knowledge and the experience necessary for the successful formation of a centralist government.

> Unsupported by the sense of imminent and common danger, the articles of confederation were found insufficient to accomplish the purposes of a national government. They conferred upon congress the power, not to raise money, but merely to make requisitions upon the states. These were often disregarded ... public creditors were unpaid .... Neither did [they] confer the power to regulate commerce... (Hale, 1826, p. 202).

The articles provided for individual state sovereignty. Ultimate loyalty was to the state and not to the unified colonies. There was no provision for standardized currency. Tolls for roads changed as state borders were crossed. Governmental authority was highly decentralized in nature--so much so that this grand experiment in governance was inadequate to overcome the deeply rooted particularism that had developed over the hundred years of the American experience. Forsyth (1981) states that the Articles formed a union which was more a delegation of powers than a union of power. This idea represents an extremely decentralist government, or, more specifically, an attempt at the formation of a decentralized union.

The Articles of Confederation placed state sovereignty above union resolution. Article 2 specifically addresses the issue of state sovereignty. "Each state retains its sovereignty, freedom, and independence, and every power, jurisdiction and right, which is not by this confederation, expressly delegated to the United States, in Congress assembled" (The American's Guide, 1820?, p. 373). It is interesting to note that the rationale in Article 4, Section 1 for the formation of a confederation is nearly identical to that of the rationale used in the first attempt at "consociation" in the early 1640s. This article states that the confederation was formed "the better to serve and perpetuate mutual friendship and intercourse among the people of the different States in the Union..." (American's Guide, 1820?, p. 373).

To compensate for the lack of success of the "Articles of Confederation and Perpetual Union," and to foster ratification of a new constitution, the birth of The Federalist Papers occurred. These papers appeared as editorials in the most influential newspaper of the day, the Independent Journal. The Federalist Papers, written while the provisions for the Constitution were being developed, were penned collectively by Alexander Hamilton, James Madison, and John Jay under the pseudonym, "Publius." They were part of a vigorous debate, and they often appeared on the same pages with

rival essays, known as the Federal Farmer Essays, which attacked the Constitution and sharply questioned the motives and maneuvers of its proponents (Fitzwangler, 1984, p. 10). Collectively, the Anti-Federalists who penned the Federal Farmer Essays (Richard Henry Lee being chief among the Anti-federalist writers) addressed such issues as human rights, systems of checks and balances, and representation.

The United States of America was founded out of a desire to wrangle control, authority, and power from the hands of the few, the aristocratic elite, and place that power into the hands of the many, the common men. Many colonists were afraid that power and domination by the select would lead to tyranny. Patrick Henry, for example, greatly feared a new despotism replacing the old and opposed even the suggestion of strengthening the federal union. The majority of the country's inhabitants feared a centralist government. The job of the Federalists was, therefore, to convince a majority of the American people that governance by the few (interpreted as the more able) would be in the best interest of everyone. (Constitutional Compromises, 1851).

The primary rationale surrounding the notion of centralization of government was the concept of power. "The first principle upon which governments are formed, is this: that consolidation produces power"

(Constitutional Compromises, 1851, p. 385). With the publication of the Federalist Papers, Hamilton, Madison, and Jay, were attempting to determine the manner in which this consolidation would come into being. These writers sought ratification of the American Constitution. In so doing, they had to persuade the public that a centralist, consolidated form of government was in its best interest. Hamilton, in No. XXIII of The Federalist wrote:

> The principal purposes to be answered by union are these--the common defense of the members; the preservation of the public peace as well as against internal convulsions or external attacks; the regulation of commerce with other nations and between the States; the superintendence of our intercourse, political and commercial with foreign countries (Bourne, ed., 1901, Vol. 1, p. 152).

In achieving the goal of gaining acceptance of a centralist government, The Federalist had to convince the American people that consolidation of powers was advantageous. To gain the acceptance of The Federalist's centralist doctrine, the Americans had to be convinced that adoption of a centralist philosophy, and by default a centralized government, would give them individual power through their protection by that government. (Constitutional Compromises, 1851).

Hamilton in The Federalist XXIII wrote that "...power ought to be coextensive with all the possible combinations.... This is one of those truths ... the

MEANS ought to be proportioned to the END; the persons, from whose agency the attainment of any END is expected, ought to possess the MEANS by which it is to be attained" (Bourne, 1901, Vol. 1, p. 153).

The "Federal Farmer" Essays: A Response

There were those who opposed a revision of the Articles of Confederation, and these individuals are known as the Anti-Federalists. Although this group has received far less attention than have the Federalists, they are, nevertheless, significant. The movement was spearheaded by Richard Henry Lee, who was for a time the President of the Continental Congress and known as a mover of the resolutions for a Declaration of Independence and a Plan of Confederation (Ballagh, 1912).

Paralleling "Publius" and The Federalist, Lee penned the "Federal Farmer" essays. In these essays, Lee presented the Anti-Federalist argument which sought to retain state sovereignty. The Anti-Federalists argued during the ratification struggle of 1787-88 that they were true federalists because the Anti-Federalist stand took its bearing from the principles of federalism which were laid down in the Articles of Confederation (Allen, Lloyd and Lloyd, 1985, p. viii). Collectively, the "Federal Farmer" essays discuss the fundamentals of a free government, the organization and powers of the

proposed government, separation of powers and a Federal versus a consolidated form of governance.

Anti-Federalist George Clinton, in a "Letter to the Citizens of the State of New York" written January 3, 1788, argued against the centralization of power. His argument pointed to the ills of a centralized government. He wrote:

> Among the many evils that are incorporated in this new system of government is that of congress having the power of making or altering the regulations prescribed by the different legislatures respecting the time, place and manner of holding elections for representatives ... instead of having the places of elections in the precincts and brought home almost to your own door, congress may establish a place, or places, at either extremes, center or outer parts of the states; at a time and season, too, when it may be very inconvenient to attend, and by these means destroy the rights of election" (Kenyon, 1966, p. 319).

Clinton, Lee and the other Anti-Federalists argued that the Federalists were abandoning the principles of federalism and substituting a centralized system (Allen, Lloyd and Lloyd, 1985, p. vii). They opposed a centralized form of government and the relinquishing of decentralized powers by the states. Lee wrote in October 8, 1787 that a consolidated government "leaves the powers of government, and the representation of the people, so unnaturally divided between the general and state governments, that the operation of our system must be very uncertain" (Kenyon, 1966, p. 198). He continues

his argument by stating that he could "consent to no government, which, in [his] opinion, is not calculated equally to preserve the rights of all orders of men in the community" (Kenyon, 1966, p. 198).

Lewis (1967) points out that most Anti-Federalists argued that the new Constitution would lead to a consolidated system of government. Additionally, claims that the Anti-Federalists reasoned that this consolidated government would lead to the destruction of the republic, a loss of independence by the states, and a sacrifice of liberty on the part of the individual. Lee's October 8, 1787 letter continued with the admonition that "as to the ... compleat [sic] consolidating plan... . If it be practicable, it is a fatal error to model our governments ... ultimately to it" (Kenyon, 1966, p. 207).

Fear of monarchical rule also dominated the Anti-Federalist rationale. Luther Martin, in a "Letter on the Federal Convention of 1787" wrote that the Federalists had the intention of destroying state governments and of establishing a national government which would be monarchical in nature. He wrote that the new powers sought by and given to the Congress

> must necessarily annihilate and absorb the legislative, executive, and judicial powers of the several States, and produce from their ruins one consolidated government,

> which from the nature of things will be an iron handed despotism... (Martin in Lewis, 1961, p. 3).

Another concern of the Anti-Federalists was that the consolidation of government would lead to an abuse of powers. They thought that the notion of consolidation pervaded the entire Constitution, and that abuse would, at the start, emanate from representation by a select group of educated individuals. American schools therefore would play, according to Richard Henry Lee, a disproportionate role in American political governance. In a letter of December 31, 1787, he discussed the notion of representation of all the peoples, especially that segment of the population five or six hundred miles from the center of government. Lee suggests that the educational system had a disproportionate effect on the formation of the republican form of government. He wrote:

> I believe, well founded, that the schools produce but few advocates for republican forms of government; gentlemen of the law, divinity, physics, &c, probably form about a fourth part of the people; yet their political influence, perhaps, is equal to that of all other descriptions of men; if we may judge from the appointments to Congress, the legal characters will often, in a small representation, be the majority... (p. 62).

The imaginations of both the Federalists and Anti-Federalists were quite active during this time. While

the Federalists showed imagination in addressing future interstate rivalries which might lead to a dissolution of the confederation if the Constitution were not ratified, the Anti-Federalists, led by Richard Henry Lee, Luther Martin, and others, far surpassed the Federalists in their forecasts. These men predicted "[the] cupidity, the brutality and the tyranny of the future unrestrained officers of the proposed government, and ... the enslavement of the people" (Lewis, 1967, p. 4).

The Infancy of American School Governance

The development of American school governance paralleled the evolution of the United States of America's governance. Long before the colonies decided to formalize a central government, each colony, individually, sought to provide for the education of its citizens.

According to Martin (1894), the evolution of American school governance and educational administration, from the mid-seventeenth century through the late nineteenth century can be categorized into three periods in American educational history: (1) the town period, characterized by the dame school with emphasis on reading and writing; (2) the period of decentralization, characterized by the district school and the academy; and (3) the modern period, the most

strongly centralized and characterized by graded levels (Martin, 1894). As we shall see, Martin's assessment of the first two periods in the evolution of American school governance and educational administration is largely valid, even today. However, Martin's characterization of the "Modern" period (roughly 1865 to 1894) as "highly centralized" is, in retrospect, inaccurate. An examination of the mechanisms of this educational evolution, and the manner of its governance from the early establishment of colonial educational practices will highlight the reasons for this inaccuracy.

The Massachusetts assembly was "the first body in which the people, by their representatives, ever gave their own money to found a place of education" (Palfrey, 1859, Vol. 1, p. 548). Palfrey (1859, Vol. 1) notes that in the seventh year since the transportation of the Massachusetts charter, the thoughts of the freemen "had the attention to bestow the wants of posterity ... [and the] ... well-being of a commonwealth ... [hence] ... the court agreed to give four hundred pounds towards a school or college..." (p. 548).

Early Recorded Legislative Activity: Public Schools

"There is scarcely a feature of school instruction or school discipline and management that has not been differentiated in Massachusetts at some epoch within its

[three hundred] year history" (Harris, in Martin, 1894, p. vi). Scholars (Palfrey, 1859-1865; Harris, 1894; Martin, 1894; Essert and Howard, 1952; Fitzwater, 1957) have suggested that early school district organization and reorganization were rooted in Massachusetts. Early legislation in that state provided the foundation for today's educational system. When a group of ministers united in support of the Legislative Act of 1642, support for public education in the colonies was born. While this specific piece of legislation did not provide for the establishment of schools, it did set precedent for them. The act basically stated that "taking into consideration the great neglect of many parents and guardians in training up their children in learning and labor and other employments which may profit the Commonwealth" every town shall have the power to hold said parents and guardians accountable for their children's education and employment (Palfrey, 1860, p. 46; Martin, 1894, p. 8). At this stage in the evolution of American school governance, responsibility for the education of the country's youth was placed in the hands of the parents or guardians. Authority, control and power over educational governance, therefore, was largely decentralized in nature. It existed in this decentralized state at a time the colonies were embattled in a centralist/decentralist philosophical debate.

The Legislative Act of 1642 held four provisions. These provisions allowed for (1) the universal education of youth; (2) the obligation upon the parent to furnish this education; (3) the State's right to enforce this parental obligation; and (4) the State's authority to fix the standard of education. The control over American educational governance during this period was a highly decentralized one (Martin, 1894, p. 14).

While this specific piece of legislation did not directly provide for the establishment of public schools, it did bring to the forefront a recognition of the necessity for the universal provision of education. This idea was an innovative one and evolved as a product of the era. Its development was tied to the Puritan value system, and was, moreover, a manifestation of the acceptance on the part of the citizenry of the necessity and importance of schools and schooling.

While this act is the earliest state law recorded, it is not the earliest reference to public school support by the colonies (Palfrey, 1858). The earliest mention of a public school in Boston is found in the minutes of the town meeting of Boston on April 13, 1635 (Seybolt, 1969, p. 1). Those minutes record the appointment of a schoolmaster who was charged with nurturing and teaching the children. Palfrey (1858) and Seybolt (1969) state that there is no record of whether or not the called-for school was ever established, but

point out that at a "general meeting of richer inhabitants" on August 12, 1636, monies were pledged providing for a one-year's salary for a schoolmaster. These records fail to indicate whether or not that desire for a school and schoolmaster ever came to fruition, but they serve to highlight a growing popular awareness of the necessity and value of a universal provision for publicly supported schools (Seybolt, 1969, p. 1).

The Compulsory Education Law of 1647 expanded on the Legislative Act of 1642. In addition to the four provisions of the Legislative Act of 1642, the 1647 law provided that (1) public money for education be raised in the form of a general tax, and (2) education higher than the rudiments be provided for by the state. (Martin, 1894, p. 15). The second provision forwarded some responsibility for schooling from the town to the state. This move suggests that, at some level, a centralist philosophy began to take root in this early stage in the development of American school governance.

Palfrey (1859) and Martin (1894) record that the "statement is frequently made that Massachusetts, by its law of 1647 established a system of free public schools--first in the world" (Martin, 1894, p. 46). Its significance, however, lies not in whether or not it was the first such attempt, but that it presents a rationale for the evolution of American educational governance and

educational administration. The act does herald the beginning of state support for public education. The Legislative Act of 1642, in its entirety, reads:

> It being one chief project of that old deluder, Satan to keep men from the knowledge of the Scripture, as in former times by keeping them in an unknown tongue, so in these latter times by persuading from the use of tongues, that so at least the true sense and meaning of the original might be clouded by false glosses of Satan's seeming deceivers, - that learning may not be buried in the grave of our fathers, in the church and commonwealth, the Lord assisting our endeavors, -
>
> It is therefore ordered, that every township within this jurisdiction, after the Lord hath increased them to the number of fifty householders, shall then forthwith appoint one within their town to teach all such children as shall resort to him to write and read, whose wages shall be paid either by the parents or masters of such children or by the inhabitants in general, by way of supply, as the major part of those that order the prudentials of the town shall appoint; provided those that send their children be not oppressed by paying much more than they can have them taught for in other towns. And it is further ordered, that when any town shall increase to the number of one hundred families or householders, they shall set up a grammar school, the master thereof being able to instruct youth so far as they may be fitted for the university; and provided that if any town neglect the performance hereof above one year, then every such town shall pay five pounds to the next such school, till they shall perform this order.
>
> (Palfrey, 1860, pp. 262-263).

By the enactment of this law, the colonists intended to establish the first public school system. Clearly, then, the evolution of public education

emerged from a particular premise that everyone should be taught to read to gain knowledge of the Bible and to resist Satan.

The schools mandated by the law were public schools, and as such were intended to be free to all who wanted an education. Scholars (Martin, 1894, Draper, 1894) dispute the validity of the claim, however, that this law provided for a system of free public schools because the law made public support permissive rather than compulsory. However, Palfrey (1860) claims that Boston, Massachusetts had a school with public support in its fifth year, around 1642; New Haven, Connecticut as early as 1642 had a provision for the education of the young and voted a "yearly allowance" to meet public education's needs; and the town of Hartford, Connecticut had made a similar arrangement (p. 47).

Additionally, other Boston town meeting records indicate a continued press for the institution of common schools in Massachusetts as early as November 11, 1647. "In the second year of Winthrop's fourth series of service as governor, he had the satisfaction of giving his official sanction ... [to an ordinance which declared that] ... since the seventeenth year of Massachusetts, no child of her has been able to say, that to him poverty has closed the book of knowledge..." (Palfrey, 1860, p. 262). Compounding the issue, Carruth (1972) reports the establishment, by 1646, of the first

law in Virginia which provided for the education of the poor (p. 17). However, this law provided for apprenticeships and made no provision for "book learning."

The First Public Schools: A Dispute

Draper (1892) takes exception with Martin (1892), for he claims that the 1647 law merely provided for two things: (1) that a town of fifty or more households designate a person to teach the children to read and write and (2) that the second mandate of the law, which Martin uses as basis for the establishment of a public school system, never mentions a school as such, but merely the necessity for teaching children to read and to write. Draper ignores the lines 31-32 of the "Old Deluder Satan Act" which state that "...they shall set up a grammar school... ." Additionally he points out that while this law may well have been on the books as early as 1647, little or nothing was done on the part of the towns toward public education. "The Massachusetts law did not receive all the children of the people. No boys were received under seven years of age till 1818. No girls of any age were admitted prior to 1789" (Draper, 1892, p. 321). However, Draper's logic overlooks the provisions of the law and ties provisions for education with accomplished fact.

Draper (1892) asserts that it was the State of New York and not Massachusetts, and the Dutch and not the English, who were primarily responsible for the forward movement of education in the colonies. Writing a very emotional response to Martin's 1892 speech to the Massachusetts State Board of Education, Draper contradicts almost everything that Martin records.

Drawing from Draper's analysis and expanding this argument somewhat (while never actively engaging in a debate over who was first), Essert and Howard (1952) write that "the origins of public education in New York State reach back beyond the voyage of Henry Hudson and the North Country explorations of Samuel Champlain ... to the political and social union created about 1570 among five tribes of Indians..." (p. 6). However, after an extensive analysis of the origin and development of a system of public education in the state of New York and a comprehensive analysis of the legislative activity of that state between the years 1777 and 1850, Hobson (1918) concluded that "when New York became a state [on July 9, 1776] it had no system of schools and was unhampered by any traditional legislative policy relative to education except that of doing nothing" (p. 17). Additionally Hobson (1918) points out that "the first constitution of the State of New York, adopted in 1777 and continuing in force until 1821, contained no reference to education" (p. 4). This is not to indicate

that there was not, at the very least, interest in an educational system during the time of New York's state constitutional ratification process. One of the principal writers of the New York constitution, John Jay, was called away during the ratification process. Hobson (1918) indicates that Jay might have included an education clause in that constitution. She writes that Jay asserted that he "would have been for a clause 'for the support and encouragement of Learning'" (p. 4).

When paralleling this early development of schools with that of the forms of governance, Martin (1894) writes that the "manner in which the public schools in Massachusetts were accomplished was adopted as a matter of convenience 'not of right' not at all with any conscious reference to any theory of local autonomy" (p. 47). The towns, he argues, had no rights. And concerning the bestowing of power for governance, Martin (1894) remarks that "the towns were not first settled, then grouped into the State. The State was first, as a legal entity. The territory was the territory of the State, and the supreme authority was in the State" (p. 47).

At the heart of the matter here is the source of power. From whence did power emanate in the infancy of the confederacy? Did it come from the people or the state? Martin contends that towns were not the source of power. Traditionally, when one thinks of power and

the methods whereby power is delegated, one thinks of that power which emanates from the bottom up, that is, the town bestowing power to the state and the state to a national government. "Instead of the town being the source of power, and delegating power to the State, as the State has done to the United States, the towns are but creations of the State and under its sanction" (Martin, 1894, p. 47).

Conclusions Drawn from the Colonial Period

Scholars (Hale, 1826; Frost, 1852; Palfrey, 1858-1865; Bourne, 1901; Ballagh, 1912; Jensen, 1948; Lewis, 1967; Forsyth, 1981; and Allen, Lloyd and Lloyd, 1985) point to the dominating philosophy during the evolution of the American national government during the Colonial Period as that of "consociation," "consolidation," or "confederation." However, the dominating method employed in the governance of the American colonies during this period was one of decentralization. While arguments abounded for the centralization of power, the concept of state sovereignty ruled and individual state control remained prevalent. The reasons for this apparently centralizing state of affairs are many and varied.

First of all, as the American people grappled with the task of the formation of a government acceptable to everyone, they made numerous attempts at the formation

of some type of centralized unification. Very early on, a "Consociation" was formed of the "four principle Colonies" of New England. While this initial attempt at "consociation" was unsuccessful, the philosophy of consolidation was tried repeatedly. One such attempt, perhaps the best known, was the establishment of the "Articles of Confederation and Perpetual Union." These Articles were drafted as a proposition for a centralized union of the states. But this so-called "confederation" was actually a continuation and perpetuation of the highly decentralized structure, which was finally unsuccessful because no individual state was willing to relinquish its powers. The notion of state sovereignty prevented any successful unification. The Articles represented a union of convenience, made inconvenient because of a lack of consensus. Their confederation repeatedly failed, but it set the stage for the form of American governance which was to evolve.

Following the lack of success of the "Articles of Confederation and Perpetual Union," came the Federalists, who argued for a strong "consolidated" system of governance. Consociation gave way to the ideas of consolidation or centralization of power. With this consolidated government came cries from the opposition, known as the Anti-Federalists, that this consolidation would lead to tyranny. Reasons for not consolidating revolved around the preservation of State

sovereignty, fears of tyranny, brutality and cupidity, and fear of the eventual enslavement of the American people. Anti-Federalists argued that the forefathers came to this country to escape the monarchy, and that the new consolidating Constitution would indeed create a monarchical type of government.

Throughout the early development of this country, American school governance was openly and admittedly decentralized, as pointed out by Hale (1826), Palfrey (1858-1865), Hobson (1918), Martin (1894), Draper (1894), Essert and Howard (1952), and Fitzwater (1957). Governance was placed in the hands of parents, guardians, or local-town governments. When states entered into the picture, their specific role was that of assistance in the formation of or the director in the formation or provision of schools and schooling.

After these schools were formed, their control was placed in the hands of individual parents or guardians of the children. This was an era of highly decentralized, local control in the evolution of American school governance. The Legislative Act of 1647 provided that whenever schools needed more than one teacher, an additional school was created and an additional teacher retained. School district administration, therefore, fostered new schools as old schools grew in student size.

Decentralization of both American school governance and national governance, therefore, dominated the era, but there were definite centralization undercurrents with the centralization of the American national government in the lead. A decentralist philosophy dominated from the Colonial Period through to the end of the eighteenth century and the birth of Federalism, when the concept of a centralization of governmental powers came to the forefront. These developments led to a logical break in an historical analysis of the evolution of American school governance, and provide entrance into the Federalist Period, approximately 1790. It has heretofore been unclear whether, during this era, American school governance shifted from a decentralized to a centralized form of control. As the national government evolved to a more centralized form of control, did American school governance follow its lead or remain highly decentralized in nature? Or did the desire for the evolution of a centralist manner of school governance gain wider attention, yet fail to attain dominance? Our analysis begins with the birth of Federalism.

CHAPTER 3

The Federalist Period to Reconstruction: Shifts in American School Governance

> A union of hearts and a union of hands,
> A union of principles none may sever;
> A union of lakes and a union of lands,
> The American Union forever.
> (Constitutional Compromises, p. 393)

The period between 1790 and 1860 marks a time in United States history of rapid social change, considerable advancement in technologies, and numerous firsts in achievements and establishments in American government, society, business, and school governance. During this time the United States of America became involved in another war with Great Britain, the War of 1812, as well as an internal conflict which came to be known as the War Between the States or the Civil War. Additionally, the nation began two national libraries: the Library of Congress and the Library of the Surgeon General's Office (which was to become the National Library of Medicine), and the first large library network west of the Allegheny mountains was formed in Pittsburgh. Numerous social and political pressures came to bear on the nature of and development of American school governance. In 1800, for example, the only public schools in the United States were in New England (Maier, 1986, p. 332). By 1830, the country had

a population of 12,856,464 with the states of New York, Pennsylvania and Virginia each having over 1,000,000 inhabitants. New York was the most populous state with a total population of 1,913,508 individuals (Grimshaw, 1835, p. 320). It is this spiraling growth in population coupled with the changing make-up of that population which tended to direct shifts in American school governance.

David Tyack (1974), in his interpretive history of nineteenth-century public schools, asserts that during that century "it is clear that many educators ... sought the one best system through centralized control" (pp. 11-12). It is Tyack's contention that a centralist philosophy dominated the nineteenth-century "big" cities. And indeed, centralization was the dominant theme in the nineteenth-century evolution in American school governance. However, as we shall see, there was a difference between the argumentative centralist philosophical rationale, and the decentralist philosophical tendencies.

Centralist and decentralist philosophies began a roller coaster ride, with one philosophy rising over the other as the Federation of the American States evolved. During this period in the growth and evolution of the country's educational network, there were numerous pieces of educational legislation aimed at providing free public education to the citizens of entire states.

Many states in the newly formed United States were legislating for publicly supported education, with public school proponents arguing for universal education for all citizens, male as well as female, black as well as white, rich as well as poor. One important innovation during this era, for example, was the creation of the centralized school district, which supplanted the system of governance which had previously been in place.

Formation of the Central Government: The United States

With the Revolutionary War over, the nation turned its concerns to the establishment and development of a national government. In 1783 John Adams "suggested to Congress the expediency of effecting a closer union of the states, and of conferring more efficient powers upon the general government" (Hale, 1826, p. 204). By May of 1787 a constitutional convention met. George Washington was elected president by a unanimous vote and within a four month period the constitution was drafted and a consensus reached as to its contents. This constitution then went to the states for ratification. It was important that this constitution differ significantly from the "Articles of Confederation" and it did. Hale (1826) wrote that

> this constitution, under which the citizens of this republic have enjoyed such unexamined happiness and prosperity, differs in many particulars, from the articles of confederation. It connects the states more closely together, by establishing a general and supreme government composed of the three departments, legislative, executive, and judicial (p. 204-205).

Constitutional ratification brought together the United States of America, and these states collectively joined for the formation of a central government. The Federalists won their battle; the states formed a true union and that union represented a consolidation of powers. This consolidation of power was built on the premise that consolidation would produce happiness, peace and security (Hale, 1826).

A Democratic Ideal: Consolidation Produces Power

Writers during the early nineteenth century were aligning concepts of power and consolidation. Argued during these formative years was the notion that "the first principle upon which governments are formed is that consolidation produces power" (Constitutional Compromises, 1851, p. 385). The rationale for governmental consolidation during the era immediately following the Revolutionary War was that the centralization of power was the one best way to provide the happiness and security that a unified nation could bring its people. The idea of power, then, became

aligned with the idea of happiness. The unity sought for, in order to succeed, had to be controlled by a select group of master minds, i.e., the educated elite, who could more ably provide for the wants and needs for the nation because of their general education and knowledge of the world as a whole (Constitutional Compromises, 1851).

From the time of the ratification of the United States Constitution until well into the early part of the nineteenth century, the American government was almost constantly involved in conflict with foreign countries and with the native American Indian population as well. The country experienced a small naval war with France, the Tripolitan War of 1801-1805, and eventually another war with the British, the War of 1812. Collectively, these wars served to highlight the effectiveness of unification and the strength to be gained through centralization of resources and effort.

Relations with Great Britain: The Campaign of 1812

Hale (1826) writes that the "people of the United States remembered with pride, the patriotism and bravery exhibited by their army in the revolutionary war" (p. 235). The War of 1812, often known as Mr. Madison's war, has also been called the Second War for

Independence, and it signaled the end of an American dependence on the European system (Coles, 1971, p. 270).

Tucker (1954) writes that the War of 1812 holds significance because it took place during the formative years of the country. It was a time when the country felt strongly about the success of its union with its centralized authority. Any hint of disunion appeared as a threat to that success. The general perception of the War of 1812 was that this new confrontation with Great Britain heralded another fight for sovereignty, independence, and union.

Much about the War of 1812 aroused national patriotism. During this conflict the national anthem was composed, Captain Lawrence cried his now-famous admonition "Don't give up the ship," and United States forces at the Battle of New Orleans, under the command of General Andrew Jackson, inflicted over 2,000 casualties on the British Forces. It is to this war that much credit for the evolution of the independent form of American government has been given. The impact of the War had economic and political effects that were more far reaching than the military. With the lifting of the British blockade, Americans could once again export rice, cotton, tobacco, grain and other products to the waiting European market (Coles, 1971, p. 268).

Additionally, the War of 1812 stimulated growth in the manufacturing industry both during and after the war. The war created a demand for imported goods and services which could not be supplied as long as the war continued and a blockade existed. If any capital flowed into New England during the war, it was concentrated in the hands of the entrepreneurs. There were increases in the number of cotton mills, and a significant increase in technological developments (Coles, 1971). Some of the more notable developments include the spinning jenny, the cording machine, the slide lathe, better casting methods, the steam engine, automatic milling machinery, interchangeable parts, and the evolution of the concept of the assembly line (pp. 268-269).

Besides the economic effects of the War of 1812, there were some definite political side effects. Because Federalists opposed the war, their political party was ruined beyond any hope of recovery. The war was looked upon as the great "watershed of Jeffersonian Democracy" (Coles, 1971 p. 269). Out of the War of 1812, therefore, came swift and dramatic changes.

As the War of 1812 ended, and with wars of any significance out of the picture (at least for the time being), the American people were ready to turn their attention to developing the country's educational system. Because trials of wars, battles, and conflict

highlighted the necessity for educational preparedness on the part of the common man, arguments for the reformation of the American educational system began. A rationale for a shift in American school governance ensued as leaders of the national government turned their attention to education. There existed a general consensus that the state held an obligation to support education, but other means of educational support began to be recognized. Education was tied to the maintenance of the state and the prosperity of its people (Strayer, 1934, p. 580). Yet as the United States entered into the nineteenth century, focus was on the development of an educational network.

In his farewell address, George Washington pointed to the importance of education. He said that the national government should

> Promote, then, as an object of primary importance, institutions for the general diffusion of knowledge. In proportion as the structure of a government gives force to public opinion, it is essential that public opinion should be enlightened (Washington in Strayer, 1934, p. 580).

Presidents James Monroe and James Madison expressed similar ideas. Monroe stated that

> The responsibility of public servants, however well provided for by the Constitution, becomes vain and useless, if the people in general are not competent judges of all the questions which it involves. Society in every district must gain

> that portion of useful knowledge which is necessary to qualify men to discharge with credit and effect those great duties of citizens upon which free government rests (Monroe in Strayer, 1934, p. 580).

Madison expressed the same sentiment, although Strayer (1934) stated that he was the most opinionated of these early presidential advocates of universal education. Madison stated that

> A popular government without popular information or the means of acquiring it is but a prologue to farce or a tragedy, or, perhaps both. Knowledge will forever govern ignorance; and a people who mean to be their own governors must arm themselves with the power which knowledge gives. (Madison in Strayer, 1934, p. 580).

The rationale of a centralist versus a decentralist administration began to dominate educational strategy, and a shift began in the evolution of American school governance.

The Shift Begins in American School Governance

Scholars have claimed that during the infancy of American school governance, the State of Massachusetts led the way in proposing reform and initiating that reform (Mann, 1849; Martin, 1892; Harris, 1894; Essert and Howard, 1952). In 1860, for example, there were 300 public high schools in the entire United States, and one-third of those schools were found in Massachusetts

(Maier, 1986, p 334). This state also reflected those changes of philosophy between centralist and decentralist factions as American school governance evolved, and these factions eventually manifested themselves throughout the entire nation. Harris (1894) addressed the significance of Massachusetts' relationship to the roller coaster ride of centralists' and decentralists' dominance of American educational administration when he wrote that Massachusetts adopted a centralized manner of governance, later shifted that governance to the districts, and further filtered power and authority to its extreme, fostering the concept of local self-government (Harris, in Martin, 1894, pp. vi-vii).

In the centralist versus decentralist debate, at stake was the education of American children and the governance of their educational system. "From 1812 to about 1850, it was the general practice to divide a common-school district as soon as it was necessary to employ two teachers" (Essert and Howard, 1952, p. 28). At the root of this early tendency toward decentralization was the notion that an education up to the fourth grade was a sufficient one. As long as the local community could provide this rudimentary education, then the educational needs of that community were met. Whenever it became necessary to employ an additional teacher in these communities, another school

was established. What occurred, then, was the creation of numerous schools and a highly decentralized network of schools and school governance. At this time each school was considered a district unto itself. This decentralizing policy soon got out of hand and by 1827 individual communities began seeking legislation that would consolidate districts into a single school. The general consensus was that these consolidated districts would then offer advanced instruction to their youth (Essert and Howard, 1952, p. 29).

Hale (1826) writes that the nation as a whole had become concerned with the universal provision of education for the mass of population, and he points to the many pieces of educational legislation requiring the provision that education be extended to all segments of the population. With this view in mind, many of the states mandated the institution of schools for the purpose of educating all the country's youth in reading, writing, and arithmetic. Several states (Massachusetts, New York, Pennsylvania, and Virginia, among others) also legislated provisions for public and general taxes to support public education (p. 275).

Cries arose for a centralized school district that a better and more advanced education might be offered to the general public. Consolidation would bring to the general public a more effective American school governance that would more adequately meet the needs of

the entire student population. The chief reason, therefore, for the consolidation of schools was that an education, at least equal to that offered in private schools, could be offered to those who could not afford those schools.

By 1800 "the chief element of sovereignty--the power to tax--was conferred upon the people of the school districts" (Martin, 1894, p. 91). These people, initially following the decentralist tradition, were to select "a clerk, to decide upon a site for a schoolhouse, and to raise money by taxation for buying land and for building, repairing, and furnishing the house" (p. 92). The power to levy taxes for public school support was decentralized to the local communities.

Several additional steps followed which continued to decentralize power to the school districts until the year 1827. In 1817, for example, Massachusetts school districts were made corporations, with power to sue and be sued and to enforce contracts (Martin, 1894, p. 92). The delegation of such powers to the district schools led to the formation of several district schools within the same town. Because the population was accustomed to the town meeting form of government, and was guardedly jealous of any hint of centralized control, an extremely

large number of school districts were created each with independent methods of educational administration (Carlton, 1965, p. 18).

However, scholars (Martin, 1894; Essert and Howard, 1952; Carlton, 1965) concluded school district power reached its culmination in 1827. These scholars claim the year 1827 marks the "utmost limit to the subdivision of American sovereignty--the high water-mark of modern democracy, and the low water-mark of the Massachusetts school system" (Martin, 1894, p. 93; Carlton, 1965, p. 19).

Massachusetts' lead in the evolution of American school governance during the Colonial Period soon faltered as the state's system of educational administration regressed during the years 1789 to 1839. This period marked a fifty year span when the central authority for educational governance gave way to an increase in local self-government. During these fifty years, a decentralist philosophy, which strayed from the ecclesiastical or theocratic centralist philosophy of the Colonial Period, dominated. Harris, in Martin (1894), notes that the "farthest swing in the pendulum in this direction was reached in 1828, when the districts [in Massachusetts] obtained the exclusive control of the schools in all matters except in the ... examination of teachers" (pp. x-xi).

While a decentralist philosophy, a philosophy of dissociation, pervaded during this time, it should be noted that during the seventy or so years in which this decentralist philosophy dominated the nineteenth century, centralist supporters waged constant battles against the district system. Harris, in Martin (1894), points out that the district system of American educational administration in several states, Massachusetts among them, was abolished at least four times before 1882 by legislative reform. In each instance save the last, school district abolition was quickly repealed by those same legislators. In 1853, for example, Acts of 1853, Chapter 153, mandated authority to individual school committees to discontinue specific school districts, and within four years this law was repealed.

A second attempt at the abolition of the school district system appears in Acts of 1857, Chapter 254, when the Massachusetts legislature in its Spring session unilaterally abolished the school district system. Within that same year, however, in its Autumn session, the legislature repealed its abolition. Twelve years later, the Acts of 1869, Chapters 110 and 423, once again abolished the district system. Practically within minutes of that meeting, upon petition of the townspeople, the Senate passed a resolution which allowed individual towns by a two-thirds vote to

reestablish the district system. Successful abolition of the district system finally occurred, nevertheless, in 1882. The Legislative Acts of 1882, Chapter 219, permanently abolished the district system of American school governance and educational administration in the state of Massachusetts (Martin, 1894, 204-205).

The State of Massachusetts reflected the national condition of education. During the period leading to the appointment of Horace Mann to the Board of Education in Massachusetts, the public school system and its governance entered into a period of decline. This decline would prove to be a major contributing factor in a philosophical shift in the rationale for the manner under which American schools were governed.

There were primarily two types of educational institutions during the first half of the nineteenth century--the district school and the academy. Scholars (Mann, 1849; Martin, 1894; and Essert and Howard, 1952) credited the academy as another important reason for this change or shift in philosophical rationale from a decentralist to centralist one. The academy's importance within the framework of the philosophical shift was due to its success throughout New England. The abilities and achievements of the academy served to highlight the degree to which success could be achieved through a consolidation of efforts, resources, facilities and personnel.

The academies were founded for the specific purpose of providing preparation for young men for entrance into college. Barnard (1856) states that the term academy can be traced to Charles Hammond, principal of the Monson Academy and author of "New England Academies and Classical Schools" (Thursfield, 1945, p. 105-106). An underlying purpose of the academy was to stimulate public sentiment to raise the educational standards of the country and to broaden its scope. Proponents of the academy hoped that a liberal education for the entire population would be the end result of the academy movement (Martin, 1894, pp. 120-122).

Additionally, Carlton (1965) points to four additional disintegrating forces which contributed to the decline in public education in the United States during the early part of the nineteenth century. These disintegrating forces were:

> a) The decline in the power of the Puritan theocracy and the increasing strength of various religious sects;
>
> b) the enlargement of the sphere of settlement, and the subsequent development of the district system;
>
> c) war, internal dissensions and the formation of a new government distracted the attention from the field of education; and
>
> d) the decrease in mutual interdependence among the settlers and the weakening of the spirit of clannishness (pp. 20-21).

There remained, nevertheless, a faith in the religious and civic values of education and a belief that land grants could be used effectively for educational purposes (Carlton, 1965, p. 21).

American School Governance in Transition

In tracing the evolution of educational administration, four fundamental influences on the system of public education can be found. These influences are (1) the growth of the population and of the manufacturing industry, (2) the extension of suffrage, (3) the humanitarian movement, and (4) the labor movement. Collectively, these influences significantly contributed to the centralizing tendencies exhibited by American school governance, at least in the very large centers of population. What were these movements and what effect did each of them have on the transition and evolution of the system of public education?

The steady growth in the population coupled with a gradual transfer of industrial occupations from the household to small industry and subsequently to larger industrial operation had a direct bearing on the evolution of American school governance. The beginning of the nineteenth century marked a steady flow in new inventions and innovations. Some of the more important inventions of the first thirty years of the nineteenth

century which revolutionized industrial methods were the power loom, the use of the hot-air blast in iron smelting, the inventions of the mower, the reaper, the sewing machine and the friction match. (Carlton, 1965, p. 34). The centralization of operations, facilities and personnel in the technical industries served as an example of the measure of success which might be achieved through a consolidation of efforts and resources (Carlton, 1965).

The notion of suffrage played a key role in the evolution of school governance. The extension of the privilege of voting held importance for the first half of the nineteenth century, and this extension contributed to the shift in American school governance. New voices were now added to debates over taxation for the provision of a public education, and school administrators became accountable to larger numbers of voters.

Carlton (1965) wrote that the American people were concerned over the issue of suffrage because of their past experience with aristocratic rule, and because of the feeling of inequality which they faced prior to the Revolutionary War (p. 35). J. B. Andrews in The Common (1905, p. 346) wrote that "nothing will force the government classes to recognize the workingmen's claim

and judge them fairly, until they find them wrestling into their own hands real political power" (Carlton, 1965, p. 38).

Those who opposed the universal granting of suffrage feared that once the general population was extended the right to vote, the "aristocratic elite" would lose its control over the newly voting public who could choose either to tax or not to tax themselves for public support of education. Suffrage and the centralization of American school governance are two movements which were inextricably intertwined with the humanitarian and labor movements. These social phenomena were interwoven with educational advancement of the period. It is important to note, at this point, the reasons for the rise of the humanitarian and labor movements, the forces which led to these movements' decline or dilution, and each movement's relationship to the evolution of American school governance and educational administration (Carlton, 1965, p. 40).

The humanitarians wanted a continuation of the paternalistic manner of maintaining the domestic economy. "They saw the existing evils of child and women labor, pauperism ... and unemployment" (Carlton, 1965, p. 45). They also felt that advancing industrial technologies would lead to a disintegration of the family. They were offended by the impersonality of the industrial network. Carlton (1965) states that the

humanitarians saw the rise of the industrial leader not only as a rise to control industry and wealth, but also as a means to gain political and social control of the affairs of life and state. Hence, humanitarians joined forces with educational reformers in urging for tax-supported schools.

Immediately prior to Horace Mann's assumption of a position of educational prominence, arguments for and against free, tax-supported schools or educational advancement abounded. Carlton (1965) summarized and arranged these arguments for tax-support of public education in order of importance. Basically arguments for tax-supported education clustered around a recognition that education was necessary for the preservation of the free institutions; tax-support inhibited class distinctions; those educated tended to be less involved in criminal activity; those educated had higher lifestyles, and were more financially secure; education was held to be a natural right of the individual and it tended to rectify distinctions between class and wealth (pp. 48-49).

Those who argued against tax-supported education did so on the grounds that the provision of a free education would increase the tax burden of society as a whole; this taxation for the maintenance of free public schools was felt to be a fundamental violation of the rights of the individual; dominant religious influences

might hurt the less powerful religious sects. Non-English speaking individuals feared that their native languages might be lost to them if a system of free, tax-supported schools were made available to the general public. Some argued that education available to the masses could not possibly benefit those masses. And finally, some argued that public education would break down social barriers which should not be broken (Carlton, 1965, p. 50).

Horace Mann and Early Centralization Efforts

Horace Mann, a strong supporter of public education, was appointed Secretary of the State Board of Education in Massachusetts in 1837. Mann believed an investment in human capital would return to society good citizens. He believed that if our young were not educated, the nation would go down in destruction. The office of Secretary was a new one created in spite of opposition by ardent decentralists who wanted control of schools, hence of American school governance, to remain local. The creation of this position was the first step leading to the birth of a movement toward the centralization of American school governance. This movement seemed to the individualists [read decentralists] to be "an ominous departure from the

ideal of individual liberty which the republic was established to perpetuate" (Caldwell and Courtis, 1925, p. 1).

Caldwell and Courtis (1925) explain that during the time when Mann was appointed to the post of Secretary of the State Board of Education, control of the local schools had been chiefly the responsibility of a "select committee." Each school, therefore, functioned as its own separate organization. The schoolmaster held complete control over the school and its daily operation (p. 1). This managerial style represents a complete decentralization of authority and control. When asked or told, therefore, that these schoolmasters and these "select committees" were to relinquish their control over the daily school governance, considerable resistance to that movement arose.

Mann set out to achieve a complete reorganization of the Massachusetts school governance structure and to centralize much of its management. He sought to rectify that which he perceived his forerunners had left undone. Hinsdale (1898, 1911) states that "Mr Mann [addressed] ... the principal questions that immediately confronted him.

> 1. The whole State needed to be thoroughly aroused to the importance and value of public instruction.
>
> 2. The public schools needed to be democratized; that is, the time had more than come when they

> should be restored to the people of the State, high as well as low ....
>
> 3. The public necessities demanded an expansion of public education in respect to kinds of schools and range of instruction.
>
> 4. The legal school organization and machinery, as existing, were not in harmony with the new social conditions. Moreover, current methods of administration were loose and unbusinesslike.
>
> 5. The available school funds were quite insufficient for maintaining good schools, and called loudly for augmentation.
>
> 6. The schools were, to a great extent, antiquated and outgrown in respect to the quantity and quality of the instruction that they furnished, as well as the methods of teaching, management, discipline and supervision (pp. 115-116).

At issue for Mann, therefore, was the reorganization of the structure of American school governance to a more centralized style, one that would facilitate greater control over the day-to-day operations of each school in concert. In other words, Mann concluded that a consolidated, centralized mode of American school governance would arouse the public to the importance and the value of public instruction. Schools would become more democratized and restored to the people of the State. The kinds and ranges of instruction could be increased thereby allowing the public education sector to compete more effectively with the private sector. A more harmonious, businesslike administrative structure would make the legal organization and machinery of American school governance

function more harmoniously. And finally, a businesslike operation would afford more effective use of funds; therefore, better schools could be maintained with improved quality of management, instruction, discipline and supervision (Hinsdale, 1898).

Nearly fifteen years later, the State of New York followed Massachusetts' lead. New York devised perhaps one of the most significant pieces of new legislation to arise out of this early school consolidation movement. This legislation is known as the Union Free School Act of 1853. Basically this act allowed two or more "common school" districts to unite for the purpose of providing an academy, a 'high school,' and to allow local boards of education to administer these consolidated or unified districts. Hobson (1918) concluded that "the act for the establishment of Union Free schools in 1853 placed the academic departments, out of which high schools developed" (p. 177). Following closely on the heels of this act is the Act of 1854 which "created the State Superintendent of Public Instruction and transferred to him the supervision of the common schools" (Hobson, 1918, p. 177). The years 1853 and 1854, then, were the years during which the central school district was born.

The passage of these pieces of legislation did not end the debate over who was to maintain power and control over the schools. Hobson (1918) contended that conflict existed over who had authority and the power of

supervision. The question remained whether power over school governance remained in the hands of the board of regents or in the hands of the "visitation" superintendent. Nevertheless, this movement is significant because it was

> ... in effect, a co-operative [sic] undertaking by groups of neighborhoods to provide greater educational opportunities for every child, and end a vertical monopoly by the children of wealthy families, of broad social, scientific and economic training. (Essert and Howard, 1952, p. 29).

The National Government Becomes Involved

Hale (1826) addressed the issue of a national concern for the universal provision of education. He contended that the United States government claimed that all the peoples of the land could read and write. He wrote that "the national government had not been unmindful of the importance of universal education" (p. 275). Hale recounted that before the adoption of the Constitution the United States government acquired all unappropriated lands and from this unappropriated, acquired land set aside 640 acres for use by schools. "In offering this land for sale, it has reserved, in every township, one section, comprising 640 acres, for the use of schools" (p. 275). The national government, Hale believed, felt that the setting aside of these lands would "constitute a valuable and productive fund, and the system of free schools, thus planted in the

western [region], will ... produce the same benefits as in the eastern portion of the union" (p. 275). It is at this point in the evolution of American school governance that one sees a measurable amount of influence on the part of the national government on American schools. It provides evidence and support for the growing centralizing tendencies in American school governance. As a whole, however, the national government's involvement in American school governance appears in the latter part of the nineteenth century.

A Union Prepares for War: A War Against Itself

Throughout this period when education experienced phenomenal change, the American government found itself dealing with the issues of slavery, abolition and the economy from two diametrically opposed perspectives: the North and the South. By the early 1830s the country was embattled in a strong controversy over the issue of slavery, and quickly a unified nation began to polarize. Dumond (1939) suggests that "all historians are agreed that there would have been no civil war if there had been no American Negro slavery ... [they] would write ... [that slavery was] ... so deep seated a [social malady] that it threatened the principles of civil rights forever associated with the nation's birth" (p. 3). Who were the principal players in leading the unified nation to a war against itself, and to what

extent did concepts of centralization and decentralization of control bear on the resultant war and the administration of schools?

William Lloyd Garrison, Harriet Beecher Stowe and the Abolitionists

The forces which came to bear on the call for secession by the newly forming decentralist southern union, the Confederate States of America, are many and varied. There are several principal players whose combined effect on the anti-slavery movement was so profound that collectively these individuals brought the nation to the point of disunion. These individuals include, among others, William Lloyd Garrison and his tabloid, The Liberator, Harriet Beecher Stowe, and her novel, Uncle Tom's Cabin, and that group of individuals who came to be known collectively as the Abolitionists.

William Lloyd Garrison, perhaps one of the most famous of the abolitionists, led a crusade against slavery. Garrison founded a tabloid called The Liberator, and it was through this vehicle that he attacked slavery and called for its abolition.

Wilson (1872) writes that Garrison as editor and Isaac Knapp as publisher of The Liberator, called for the immediate emancipation of the slaves. He remarked that this paper was so bold and so outspoken that it was

accepted by only a few citizens. In fact, Garrison and Knapp found themselves in constant court battles, experienced frequent personal attacks, and Garrison even found himself imprisoned. Garrison and Knapp were two of the principals in the formation of the New England and New York anti-slavery societies (p. 223).

Garrison led the American Anti-Slavery Society to the close of the conflict [Civil War]. He was the first American to "unfurl the banner of immediate and unconditional emancipation [of the slaves], and to organize upon that principle which, under God, proved mighty enough to accomplish that object" (Johnson, 1881, p. xiv).

Perhaps better exemplifying the idea that the abolitionists felt that theirs was a mission from God, Garrison stated the position of the abolitionists just after the close of the Civil War, in 1867, when he spoke at a breakfast given in his honor in London. Johnson (1881) quotes from Garrison:

> I must here disclaim, with all sincerity of soul, any special praise for anything that I have done. I have simply tried to maintain the integrity of my soul before God, and to do my duty. I have refused to go with the multitude to do evil. I have endeavored to save my country from ruin. I have sought to liberate such as were held captive in the house of bondage. But all this I ought to have done (p. xv).

In addition to the writings of Garrison, another work served as a catalyst to the start of the Civil War.

Onto the scene came a novel, Uncle Tom's Cabin, and its author, Harriet Beecher Stowe. This novel, along with other abolitionist writings soon brought the United States to the brink of disunion. What were the sequences of events which led to the country arriving at this crossroads? And to what extent did the education of the people play in this disunification?

Harriet Beecher Stowe, in the preface to the first American edition to her novel stated that

> the object of these sketches is to awaken sympathy and feeling for the African race, as they exist among us; to show their wrongs and sorrows under a system so necessarily cruel and unjust as to defeat and do away the good effects of all that can be attempted for them by their best friends under it (Stowe, 1852, p. iv).

Stowe's novel deals with the life and death of a Negro slave, Uncle Tom, and his trials and tribulations at the hands of Simon Legree. By portraying the life of this slave, Stowe attempted to typify the lives of all slaves in general. Stowe's novel capitalized on all the anti-slavery societies' writings, and abolitionists' sentiments, and wrote to the moral consciousness of a nation as a whole. Her novel remained the best selling American novel of all time until the publication of Gone With The Wind in 1936. Interestingly enough both novels deal with the South during a period of time when slavery captured the minds and souls of the American people.

Stowe's novel was written from a Northern, abolitionist perspective, while Mitchell's was written from the Southern, slaveholding plantation-owner's perspective.

Abolitionist movements sprang up throughout many of the northern states. These abolitionists formed unions, and consolidated their efforts as organizations called Anti-Slavery Societies, in order to be successful. Some of the principal societies were the Pennsylvania Abolition Society, New York Abolition Society, Rhode Island Abolition Society, The Abolition Societies of Connecticut, New Jersey, Maryland, and Virginia. These societies even banded together by having national conventions. These centralizing tendencies, at first, were successful (Wilson, 1872, Volume 1, p. 19).

Anti-slavery societies were active in reaching the educated of the nation through their many and varied publications. American Slavery As It Is: Testimony of a Thousand Witnesses, is one prime example. This work, published in 1839, labels the Southern plantation owner, hence slaveholder, as wicked, quoting from Proverbs 23, "the righteous considered the causer of the poor; but the wicked regardeth not to know it" (title page).

The Abolitionists and the Anti-slavery societies focused their attacks on those acts which they could best describe as tortures of the slaves: personal narratives which recounted floggings, privations,

hunger, child beatings, nudity, fetters, chains and iron collars, among other horrors. And these writers frequently "empannelled [their readers] as jurors to try a plain case and bring in an honest verdict. The question ... is not one of law, but of fact" (American Slavery As It Is, 1839, p. 7) These writers enjoined their readers to bring a guilty verdict against the slave holders, for in writing of the ills and evils of slavery, they write that no "plainer case ever went to a jury ... you have common sense, and conscience and a human heart" (p. 7).

Of paramount importance to the writers of American Slavery As It Is were certain inalienable rights which they felt should be afforded all men. And these rights indeed extended to the slave population. These rights included "their free speech and rights of conscience, their right to knowledge, and property, and reputation," or in other words, their right to an education (pp. 7-8). The addition to the educational system of "two millions seven hundred thousand persons in these States [the slaves once freed]" (p. 7) would, as we shall see, eventually lead to a stronger centralization of some parts of American school governance at the national level.

The Election of Abraham Lincoln and the Civil War

Williams (1952) in writing of Abraham Lincoln and the generals who ran the campaigns of the Civil War, states that "the Civil War was the first of the modern total wars, and the American democracy was almost totally unready to fight it" (p. 1). The general command system for army control was decentralized; no realistically consolidated system of command emerged until nearly the end of the war in 1864 (Williams, 1952, p. 1). While this war, in and of itself, is a significant one, "historians have never agreed whether it should be called a civil war, a war between the states, a rebellion, or a war for Southern independence" (Dumond, 1939, p. 1). Additionally, scholars do not agree on which causes should be emphasized as the chief reasons for the actual beginning of the war itself. Dumond (1939) lists several reasons for the advent of the Civil War. Among those reasons which appear crucial were the crusade to abolish slavery, a struggle to maintain State's Rights, (which can be seen as a move to halt the centralization of power the Federal government was mustering), and the struggle to preserve the constitutional rights of minorities against enslaving majorities. Some have suggested that the election of Abraham Lincoln as president was the catalyst which started the war. Still others, Dumond (1939) points out, align the advent of the war with the differing

economic development of the North and the South. This confusion as to the actual cause of the war is easy to understand because "social, economic, and political issues had combined through the years to array section against section in continuous strife." What was lacking in both sections of the country was a consensus as to the nature and mission of the war (p. 1-2).

The far-reaching results of this war would hold a profound influence over the path of American school governance and educational administration. As we shall see, the national government significantly increased its involvement in the universal provision of public education to the masses including, among other things, legislation aimed at providing an education for the over two million freed slaves and the establishment of federally operated bureaus to insure that this legislation was followed.

Conclusions Drawn from the Federalist Period to Reconstruction

Political writers during the early part of the nineteenth century were concerned with concepts of power and consolidation. They reasoned that the initial confederacy of states was a step toward centralization, and these writers used as rationale for governmental consolidation the notion that this consolidation of authority and control was the one best way to provide

the happiness and security that the people of a unified nation desired. The framers of the constitution, in concert with the Articles of Confederation and the Declaration of Independence, suggested that the educated, hence, the selected elite, would best make the decisions necessary for the welfare of the general population. At the heart of their reasoning was the idea that through a voluntary relinquishing of state powers and sovereignty to a consolidated government, the individual citizen could best attain the happiness and security that they not only desired but deserved.

Educational growth and expansion quickly became intricately intertwined with the social, political, and economic issues of the day. American school governance began its roller coaster ride through decentralizing and centralizing efforts. The State of Massachusetts led the way as it had done during the Colonial Period, and as a general rule reflected the actions and opinions of the nation as a whole.

During the period dating from the Federalist Era, 1790 to the era of Reconstruction, both decentralization and centralization philosophies were prevalent in the educational network at different points in time. Arguments for and against both centralization and decentralization of school districts framed themselves in arguments over tax support for public education.

Reasoning for centralized control and therefore for centralization of state control over American school governance clustered around the preservation of the free institution, elimination of class distinctions, improvement in the lifestyles of the members of society as a whole, a decrease in criminal activity, greater financial security of the general population, and a rectification of distinctions between class and wealth.

The rationale adopted for the preservation of a decentralized control of American school governance focused on the idea that the imposition of a general tax would place an undue burden on society as a whole and that this taxation for the purpose of public education was a fundamental violation of the rights of the individuals. Some religions objected because with centralized control over American school governance, dominant religions might inhibit or hurt the less powerful religious sects. Those whose native language was other than English feared their individual native languages and heritage would be lost. Additional arguments for decentralized control of American school governance during this period included a desire not to break down social barriers and the concerns that such education for the masses could not possibly benefit society as a whole.

Since both the Abolitionists and Union Army found centralization of power and resources useful in

defeating the decentralized Confederate States of America during the Civil War, it was natural that this centralizing tendency would permeate the latter part of the nineteenth century, not only concerning governmental affairs, but also in matters of American school governance. With public, tax supported schools placed on hold for the years of the Civil War, the war-torn nation eventually faced the problem of repairing the damages of the War and "reconstructing" the South. The country entered a period of reconstruction, and a centralized American school governance began to take hold of the larger metropolitan areas of the United States.

CHAPTER 4

A National and School Governance: Centralization versus Decentralization

> The Constitution, of course, made no provision for disunion and therefore none for reunion.
>
> (Wood, 1975, p. 5)

The United States of America was growing at a phenomenal rate. In 1860, just before the outbreak of the Civil War, there were 31,443,321 inhabitants. When the century turned, that number had more than doubled to a population of 75,994,575; and as the United States prepared to enter World War I, the population increased an additional 21% to 91,972,263. Population statistics for this period in American history reveal steady growth. The 1860 figure of 31,443,321 rose to 39,818,449 by 1870. In 1880, just after the period of reconstruction of the southern states ended, the country's population had risen 26% and totaled 50,155,783. Twelve million more existed in 1890--another 26% increase which made the 1890 total a shocking 62,947,714. By 1900 that figure grew to 75,994,575, which represented an increase of slightly over 13,000,000, another 21% rise. By 1910, however prior to the advent of World War I, the United States had experienced an additional 20% increase, 15,000,000

more people for an incredible population of nearly 92,000,000 (Carruth, 1972).

While population growth was significant, its concentration "in the manufacturing and railroad centers" played a key role in the ascendency of a centralist over a decentralist philosophy during the period from Reconstruction to the advent of World War I. It is during this time that New York City took on its "melting pot" image. In 1860, for example, New York City's population included half as many Italians as there were in Italy; there were as many Germans in New York as there were in Hamburg; twice as many Irish in New York as there were in Dublin, and two and a half times as many New York Jews as there were Jews in Warsaw (Carruth, 1972, p. 350).

Decentralized American school governance and educational administration lasted until late in the nineteenth century, although administrators were philosophically arguing for centralized control. Slowly, toward the latter half of the nineteenth century, the philosophy of centralization gave way to the reality of centralization. The period stretching from the beginning of Reconstruction in 1865, to the advent of World War I and the end to the United States'

isolationist attitude, provides the background for an analysis of the eventual shift from decentralization to centralization in American educational administration.

The impact of Reconstruction on the entire Union, North and South alike, directly affected the evolution of American school governance. The social forces resulting from the actual emancipation of the slaves, the attitudes of both Reconstructionists and those opposed to Southern occupation and Reconstruction, the continuing expansion of industry, child labor laws, developing technology, and the successful pursuit of the Spanish American War, all came to bear on the awareness of and changes in American school governance and educational administration.

Additionally, the decentralist rationale used by those who opposed centralization of American school governance highlights the confrontation between centralist and decentralist forces. The decentralist argument represented the attitude of a minority of those actively involved in the educational process. Yet, as we shall see, the minority view of decentralization dominated educational administration for nearly three-fourths of the nineteenth century because control over American school governance was difficult to wrestle from the hands of the many. Opponents to the

centralization of educational administration feared that a loss of community control would somehow weaken individual identities.

Field (1881) writes of the concern of the American government to perpetuate itself. He suggested that "the perpetuity of the American Government is an object of supreme concern to every American" (p. 407). The Federal Government, therefore, virtually absorbed the chief functions of sovereignty of the states. Field (1881) also argued that from the first to the last, those who expressed opinions of the necessity for centralization used nearly the same phrases as were used in prior arguments. Many of the conclusions in particular cases, however, appeared to be at variance with those opinions (p. 415). Additionally, Field (1881) argued that "the pressures upon the Federal Government for the exercise of its [centralized] powers comes from four different quarters: the performance of the natural functions of government, the interests of the majority, the demands of party, and the schemes of monopolists" (p. 423).

The South and Reconstruction: A United Nation in Division

The South appeared devastated as the Civil War ended. Writers of this southern desolation sought to paint a grim picture of conditions in the South just

after the war. Andrews (1866) began his account of southern destruction with a description of Charleston, the city where the war began. He wrote that Charleston was left "a city of ruins, of desolation, of vacant houses, of widowed women, of rotting wharves, ... of acres of pitiful and voiceful barrenness" (p. 1). With Charleston being the rule rather than the exception, the South was in desperate need of reconstruction.

"The reconstruction era is usually defined as the period from the end of the war in 1865 to 1877 when the last federal troops were removed from the South" (Wood, 1975, p. 56). As is typical with nearly all wars, the issue of rebuilding the defeated area, in this case reconstructing the southern states of America, began while the war was still in progress. The United States government began the process of reconstruction as each southern state was defeated by the Union army. Reconstructing the South proved to be a difficult process. Chief among the reasons for this difficulty identified by Wood (1975) was "there was ... no example of postwar adjustment that government leaders could look to [for reconstruction] because there had been no war to compare with the American Civil War" (p. 2). He has suggested that, theoretically, a victory by the North would make the union whole again, at least as whole as two culturally divergent areas could become.

Dunning (1897) explained that when the Confederate army met defeat, the doctrine of state sovereignty was destroyed as well. He noted that "side by side with the assumption by the national government of unlimited control over the rights of the people, the process of gathering powers that had hitherto been left to the states went steadily during the war" (p. 60). And with the concept of State's rights dead, the power of restoring the Union fell to the national government.

During the American Civil War President Abraham Lincoln had his own plan of reconstruction and acted that plan out so long as the war lasted. He met with some measurable success and one of his programs deserves mention.

Scholars (Avary, 1906; Wood, 1975) argued that President Lincoln, as early as December, 1862, established a procedure that he hoped would test the waters and become a pattern for the reconstruction of the southern states (p. 9). His initial plan involved the State of Louisiana, and while that state remained under military governance, the election of two congressmen was supervised by army officials. These Congressmen, Michael Hahn and Benjamin Flanders, were seated by the House of Representatives, much to President Lincoln's delight. What Lincoln felt he was doing by taking this path of reconstruction in Louisiana was reinforcing the notion that Louisiana had never

actually left the Union. This action, on the part of the President, was designed to show the white citizens of Louisiana, as well as the rest of the Southern States, that its national government wanted them back in the union. By doing so, Lincoln, additionally, hoped to highlight the fairness and generosity of the national government to states who pledged their loyalty to the Union once again (Wood, 1975, pp. 9-11). It is interesting to note that while Lincoln began reconstruction in Louisiana very early on, actual carpetbag rule did not end until April 24, 1877, and while it was the first Southern state to begin reconstruction, it was the last Southern state to regain complete control of its own internal affairs of government and end its reconstruction period (Carruth, 1972, p. 312).

After the war ended, President Lincoln's centralized control over reconstruction waned, although early on there was an attempt at retention of this control. Avary (1906) reported that Lincoln "left a paper in his own hand, setting forth the terms in which any seceded State could be restored to the Union" (p. 37). In laying out the conditions for restoration to the Union, Lincoln required from the seceded states the acceptance of the Union's position with regard to the

slavery issue, complete submission to the United States government, and the complete removal of all military from the field (Avary, 1906, p. 37).

After the assassination of President Lincoln, April 15, 1865, the course of reconstruction took a decided turn. The new president, Andrew Johnson, was a vengeful president. "Upon succeeding to power Mr. Johnson breathed fire and hemp against the South, proclaimed that he would make treason odious by hanging traitors, and ordered the arrest of General Lee..." (Taylor, 1879, p. 241). Taylor (1879) claimed that Johnson was not a fit president to lead the country. He reasoned that Johnson was a slave to his temper and appetites and as a result "was unfit to control others" (p. 252).

Johnson, nevertheless, did listen to selected advisors. Upon the intervention of General Grant and after battles with Congress, Johnson returned "to [the] wise, lawful methods, and desired to restore the Union under the Constitution; and in this he was but following the [centralist] policy declared in his last public utterance by President Lincoln" (Taylor, 1879, p. 251).

The Carpetbaggers and Scalawags Enter the Picture

There were battles over who was to decide the type of reconstruction, its enforcement, and its duration. Just as misconception and folklore enveloped much of the purpose and function of the War of 1812, many negative,

derogatory misconceptions concerning the complete reconstruction of the South developed. Wood (1975) placed much of the blame for this negative view of reconstruction on a bitter and defeated South. The "carpetbaggers" and "scalawags," Wood contended, were given an unfair evaluation by many historians. In writing of the "carpetbaggers" and "scalawags," Wood (1975) stated that the South held the view that these "carpetbaggers" were nothing more than Republican charlatans who exploited opportunities to pillage. White conservatives complained that reconstructionists were led by these "carpetbaggers," who were nothing more than northern adventurers who had been lured to the South by the chance to seize political office (pp. 54-55).

Joining the carpetbaggers, allegedly, were poor white Southerners who viewed reconstruction as an opportunity for private gain. They were known as "scalawags." These individuals were viewed by former plantation owners and "plantation overlords" as seizing every opportunity to get even with those whose empires had been destroyed by the war (Wood, 1975, p. 55). The "scalawags" were hated even more than the "carpetbaggers," because "if there was one thing that made the scalawags worse than the carpetbaggers, it was their treachery to their own states and section" (Wood, 1975, p. 55).

Wood (1975) contends that these individuals have not been accurately portrayed by historians, and he describes the motivation for being in the South, both during and after the war. "Eight of the nine carpetbaggers who eventually served as governors also arrived in the South before 1867, and the ninth ... had been an army officer and military governor whose civil administration was scrupulously honest and fair" (p. 55-56). Carpetbaggers held power only in parts of the South, and their power was of a short duration. "Over half of the southern states--six out of eleven--never had a carpetbagger governor; and of those [that did] ... few of them were in office very long" (p. 56).

While Wood (1975) placed most of the blame for the "poor" reputation of the participants in reconstruction (northern businessmen, northern teachers, and various other northern workers and activists) on the southern attitude, he did recognize that the time was not free of corruption and abuse.

Reaction on the part of the South was evidenced by the formation of numerous white supremacist groups. The best-known of these groups was the Ku Klux Klan, formed in 1865. But along with this group, others formed which had, as their common objective white supremacy, including the Knights of the White Camellia (formed in several states), the White League of Louisiana, the Sons of Washington (Texas), the Society of the White Rose

(Mississippi), the Men of Justice (Alabama), the Council of Safety (South Carolina), the Constitutional Guard (North Carolina), the White Brotherhood (North Carolina), and the Pale Faces (Tennessee). All were formed initially either as groups of pranksters or for protection from the political domination of blacks and black members of the militia (Dunning, 1897, pp 356-357). However, protection and pranks were soon forgotten and terrorism became a primary goal. Their intent was, at the least, to keep the Negro from the polls and from having any voice in the election of officials (Dunning, 1897, pp. 357-359).

The United States government stepped in and instituted a series of "Force Acts" designed primarily to protect the Negro right to vote. Dunning (1897) suggested that the Congress, operating "on the assumption that the white state governments in the South were unwilling, and the black governments were unable, to protect the negro in his rights," inaugurated legislation designed to protect negro civil rights. The United States Statutes At Large, volume 16, 1870, chronicles acts which highlight a series of "offenses, involving violence, intimidation and fraud, with the effect or even intention of denying equal rights to any citizens of the United States, were made crimes and

misdemeanors, and were thus brought under the jurisdiction of the federal courts" (Dunning, 1897, pp. 357-358).

"It was in connection with the elections that the disorders assumed the most serious character. The Ku Klux Klan ... had begun ... terrorizing" (Dunning, 1897, p. 228). The Klan participated in fraud during elections. For example, the State of Louisiana during this time, was carried by the Democrats during the Presidential election. This was achieved, Dunning (1897) stated, "wholly through fraud and violence" (p. 228).

Three amendments to the Constitution were ratified during the era of reconstruction: the Thirteenth, Fourteenth and Fifteenth amendments. Collectively they had a direct impact on the Southern states. They are considered milestones for they set the fabric of contemporary American society. In total, these amendments freed the slave (the Emancipation Proclamation freed only those slaves in the rebellious territories), gave former slaves equal protection under the law, and guaranteed them the right to vote. The freed slaves were now considered truly to be freedmen, complete with all the tools which would enable them to become members of society.

The era of reconstruction left its legacy in both the North and the South. The American Civil War had all the characteristics of a family argument together with all the biases, hatreds and prejudices passed on from generation to generation. Men from the same state who fought in opposing armies underlined this situation. The war had the bitterness of an internal rebellion with each side acting as though it were an independent nation instead of a broken union (Wood, 1975, p. 90).

Concerning the legacies left by the reconstruction of the South, Wood (1975) wrote that

> [S]ince the reconstruction was so inextricably bound up with moral issues, it was difficult to be thoroughly objective about it .... The fact that one was born or educated in one region of the nation did much to influence his bias .... The reconstruction was thus the most influential episode in American history ... [it] caused no major loss of life.... Yet it was the ... great catalyst of southern sectional allegiance.... The end result was a conservative, one-party South committed to the perpetuation of white supremacy (pp. 90-91).

Educating Freedmen: A Goal of Reconstructionists

One important goal of reconstructionists was the education of the freed slaves. Black Americans now had the opportunity to become voters and officeholders, and it was reasonable to expect that these officeholders have some measurable amount of education. What was needed at this time was a system of centralized control over the educational processes of former slaves. In

order to facilitate the attainment of an education for ex-slaves, the Freedman's Bureau entered into the educational arena and centralized control over the education of Black Americans.

The Freedman's Bureau, officially named the "Bureau of Refugees, Freedmen and Abandoned Lands," was established by Congress in March 3, 1865. Its aim was to provide assistance for the numerous blacks who crowded into the Union territory after the Civil War (Fleming, 1904, No. 6, p. 3).

The First Freedmen's Bureau Act, approved March 3, 1865, made no mention of the universal provision of education for freed slaves. The Supplementary Freedmen's Bureau Act, passed over a presidential veto on July 16, 1866, mentioned schools, education and/or teachers in Sections 6, 8, and 13:

> Sec. 6. * * * Whereas [certain lands confiscated [sic] under the acts of Congress or sold for taxes by the United States tax commissioners] were in part sold [in 1863] by the said tax commissioners to 'heads of families of the African race," * * * and whereas, under the said instructions, the said tax commissioners did also set apart as "school farms" certain parcels of land * * * Therefore, * * * the sales made ... are hereby confirmed and established....
>
> Sec. 8. [Certain confiscated lands to be sold and the proceeds applied to education.]
>
> Sec 13. * * * the [sic] Commissioner of this bureau shall at all times co-operate with private benevolent associations of citizens in ai dof [sic] freedmen, and with agents and teachers, duly accredited and appointed by them, and shall hire or provide by lease, buildings for the purpose of

> education whenever such associations shall, without cost to the Government, provide suitable teachers and means of instruction; and he shall furnish such protection as may be required for the safe conduct of such schools (Statutes At Large xiv, p. 173; Fleming, 1904, No 6, pp. 6-11).

The Bureau, therefore, set up a system of 4,239 schools with a faculty of 9,300 teachers. The emphasis of these schools was on the attainment of at least an elementary education, although courses were offered through the college level. In theory, these were free schools, with free textbooks, and they made an education available to over 250,000 young and adult former slaves with success facilitated because efforts to educate the free slaves would be centralized under Freedman's Bureau control. In practice, the Bureau was able to reach only sixteen percent of its targeted population.

The Spanish-Cuban-American War: The Birth of American Imperialism

With the end of the United States' Civil War, the country began emerging as an imperialist power. It was not until the advent of the War for Cuban Independence, better known as the Spanish-American War, that it's actual emergence unfolded. This war was a very short one, only lasting three years from 1895-1898. When the war ended, the United States had expanded its territories beyond its continental border to include the annexation of Hawaii, and set in motion the programs

necessary for the annexation of other territories including Puerto Rico, Guam, and the Philippine Islands. Additionally, it was about to impose a semi-colonial status on the Island of Cuba (Foner, 1972, pp. vii-xii).

Prior to the 1890s, from about 1865 to 1890, a definite anti-imperialist attitude permeated United States sentiment. Dozier (1947) pointed out that the imperialist spirit did not actually emerge until 1895, immediately prior to the United States' entry into the Spanish-Cuban-American War. The word, "imperialism," he noted, was rarely used in debating territorial expansion, but the decade of the 1890s marked significant transition in societal and governmental attitude toward extra-continental expansion.

The United States was a welcomed ally by the Cuban peoples. Beck (1898), addressing the United States involvement in the Cuban War for Independence, noted that the American people looked upon this war as a missionary war. He wrote that the United States' entrance into the war was the act of a great nation which had already won for itself freedom and which had established a secure popular government. He noted that the American people were "generous enough and brave enough to take up the gage of battle in behalf of another people struggling to be free" (p. 4).

Similarly, de Quesada (1898) addressed the issue of the United States' involvement in the Spanish-Cuban-American War and noted that the American people supported their country's intervention in that war because they remembered their confrontation with a world power in a struggle for freedom and independence. At the turn of the twentieth century, then, the United States viewed its transcending role in both national and world affairs. Centralization of governmental control over its continental border, as well as over extra-continental territories, was on the horizon. Several significant technological developments also played key roles in the evolution of American national and school governance.

Technological Advancement: A Cause for a Shift in Centralist-Decentralist Rationale

New technological advancements during this period played a significant role in the evolution of American school governance and educational administration. Among the important technologies were automotive technologies and the electric light bulb. The invention of the automobile led to the ability to transport large numbers of students from remote areas to centralized school locations. The invention of the school bus, as we shall see in the next chapter, played an important part in the transition from decentralized school systems to more

centralized ones. And finally, the invention of the light bulb added support for the centralist's argument for the elimination of many rural one-room schools which operated without electricity.

American School Governance in Transition

Marble (1894) accented the necessity of education for all the people when he wrote that "widespread intelligence is essential in a free republic; and therefore public school education should be universal, obligatory, and free" (p. 154). At the turn of the twentieth century education was far from perfect, far from universal, only partly voluntary and only partly free. American school governance and educational administration, though evolving, remained the subject of much heated debate (Marble, 1894).

DeWeese (1900) questioned which system of educational administration would adapt itself most effectively to centralized authority. He asserted that educators were handicapped by political obligations and oftentimes were harassed by school board members. There were things radically wrong with contemporary school administrative practices. A lack of uniformity dominated this defect in American school governance. Uniform methods for selecting school boards and superintendents of education were lacking. If, then, uniformity could be obtained in the selection of these

governing bodies, the problem of school governance would be simplified and the overall effectiveness of the common school system would likewise be increased. The superintendent should be the directing force behind the educational machinery, and this superintendent should be held responsible for the success or failure of that system (DeWeese, 1900, pp. 61-63). The end result of this kind of logic led to a decentralized administration with a centrally determined core of qualifications, goals and methods.

While centralized control over American educational administration at the state level was frequently argued, centralized control by the national government was frowned upon and had few supporters. Hubbert (1898) highlighted this anti-national sentiment when he wrote that "national control upon the plan [of educational administration] which prevails in continental Europe, which confers all authority upon one man ... is so utterly opposed to the American idea of self-government and home rule as not to be entertained even as a proposition for discussion" (p. 987). Centralized control over education rested in the domain of the city, with city systems created by State law. Marble (1894) argued that State law exercised control over individual state educational administration and that it was the only sovereign power over educational governance. "Each state makes its own provision respecting the education

of its children; and though all the States are bound together under the Constitution ... there is no necessity for a general law relating to education" (Marble, 1894, p. 154). Hubbert (1898) added support to this national sentiment. He wrote that "it is our conviction that any plan of administration ... must be one which recognizes the right of the people to govern thru [sic] delegated representative school officials" (p. 987).

By the turn of the century common school enrollment reached nearly fourteen million pupils. The school systems throughout the United States employed over four hundred thousand teachers who taught in roughly two hundred thirty thousand schools. Approximately two-thirds of the $150,000,000 spent on common school education was derived from local taxes. The entire common school system throughout the United States had grown to such proportions that calls began arising for a centralized control over school supervision.

Kern (1906) pointed to some of the successful school consolidations in the United States. He noted that by 1906 twenty states had consolidated country schools and the transportation of the children attending those schools.

> Consolidation of country schools and the transportation of children is now going on in the states of Connecticut, Florida, Indiana, Illinois, Iowa, Kansas, Nebraska, New Hampshire, Maine, Massachusetts, Wisconsin, Vermont, South Dakota, Rhode Island, Pennsylvania, Ohio, North Dakota, New York, New Jersey, and California. These states represent over half the population of the United States (Kern, 1906, p. 14).

Kern (1906) credited much of the success of these consolidation efforts to the report of the "Committee of Twelve on Country Schools" which was made at the Milwaukee meeting of the National Education Association in July 1897. It brought to the attention of educators the problems inherent with the proliferation of decentralized rural school districts, and it functioned to highlight the potential advantages of consolidated efforts.

Kern (1906) additionally identified several reasons why centralization of schools should be considered. He wrote that "the future will be characterized by fierce competition, in which technical skill and a high degree of training will be necessary qualifications for success" (p. 17). Consolidation of efforts would allow for the higher degree of educational training necessary for the rural school child to compete effectively in the industrialized, technologically advancing twentieth century. The farmer, Kern (1906) wrote, "is beginning

to realize that he must know something of the scientific basis upon which successful farming depends. He must be a thinker..." (pp. 17-18).

Kern (1906) summarized the advantages of consolidated schools, and in doing so identified four primary advantages with additional secondary advantages noted within those primary ones. He wrote that with centralization

> (1) all the children of a township can be brought together in one building, and thus will result the inspiration that always comes from numbers.
>
> (2) the children of the township have the same chance for higher educational advantages, which under the present plan only five or ten per cent are able to get by leaving home and going to the city. With a central graded school and a high school course the children can be at home evenings under the care of their parents.... The poor man who has been able to send his children only to ungraded district schools, will have the pleasure of seeing his children given the best education.
>
> (3) the health of the children is guarded. With transportation to a central school there are no wet feet and clothing, and consequent sickness and impaired constitutions.
>
> (4) we go a long ways toward the solution of the problem 'How to Keep the Boys on the Farm.'... With a library room, music, debating club, etc, our boys and girls will hesitate to leave home (pp. 21-23).

Modern educational practice was drifting toward centralization. DeWeese (1900) noted that one of the most gratifying features of modern educational progress was the steady shift toward the centralization of

authority and responsibility for educational results as educational governance drifted toward the small school boards with greater power vested in the superintendent of schools. The office of the superintendency afforded American school governance "harmonious and successful administration" (p. 65).

The Superintendency: An Evolving Administration

At the turn of the twentieth century, the office of the superintendent was still considered a comparatively new one, although the concept existed and some superintendents had been in place for nearly sixty years. In 1837, for example, Buffalo, New York appointed a school superintendent; Providence, Rhode Island elected one two years later in 1839. City superintendents of education evolved as the highly decentralized district system took hold of American school governance and educational administration. Quickly these city superintendents would give way to the rising state superintendency (Thwing, 1898, pp. 32-33).

As we have seen, Massachusetts had a state superintendent in place in the early part of the nineteenth century as well (Maxwell, 1898, pp. 38-41). The powers and duties of the office were still being delineated and debated, with centralized versus decentralized control over that office argued. Calls for centralization of authority began gaining support. This

call for centralized supervision was to result in the increased power and effectiveness of the State Superintendent of Education.

The superintendent's appointment was not without cause for debate. Webster (1897) asserted that during the latter half of the nineteenth century centralized control had been gradually extended to nearly all aspects of educational administration. He also claimed that the system of state aid to public education was firmly established, and that the granting of this aid, on the part of the states, held with it the implication that the state held control over education. One of the chief ways that the state controlled education was through funding. The methods that the states used to acquire the necessary monies to fund education were numerous forms of taxes, licenses, and users fees. Webster (1897) wrote that

> The following are only part of the many species of funds and taxation for education: tax on banks, savings banks, trust companies, etc; tax on dogs and other animals; tax on railroads; fines for intoxication and other offenses against the State; licenses for auctioneers, brokers, circuses, liquors, taverns, restaurants, marriages, etc; percentage of fees of justices of the peace, prothonotaries, recorders of deeds, and other public officers; poll taxes, proceeds of sales of public lands; moneys arising from the lease of oyster lands; proceeds of the sale of escheats, estrays, unclaimed lands, etc,; proceeds of tax sales; dividends on State Bank, riparian rents and sales; saline funds, convicts; hire, mill tax, etc, etc." (Webster, 1897, p. 13).

It is significant to realize that, at this point in the evolution of American school governance the State was gaining an ever-increasing control upon education. Thus "the establishment of State school funds ... inaugurated a system of State control and intervention of school[s]." The state providing funds for schools and developing a system of taxation for the provision of those funds, marked the beginning of centralized control over American school governance (Webster, 1897, p. 156).

In reasoning for State funding and centralized control over educational administration, proponents argued that centralization would highlight the need for a central State education system, lead to a better school system, and would make certain that the schools in different localities would provide the period of schooling required by law and instruction in all required courses of study, that they would employ more competent teachers, enforce compulsory attendance, and provide the use of prescribed textbooks in many cases (Webster, 1897, pp. 14-15).

Thwing (1898) wrote that "[the] bald and bare fact [of the phenomenal growth of the common schools] indicates the absolute need of the best supervision and administration usually vested in a single officer..." (p. 26). Also contributing to further centralizing tendencies was the permanent establishment of the Office

of the "Superintendent of Public Instruction." This individual was assigned duties and responsibilities which varied from state to state. Thwing (1898) argued that even as late as the turn of the century, this office was considered to be a new one. He calls it a "new profession." The office was considered to be an important one. "The well-trained superintendent may render better service of the improvement of our schools than any officer" (Thwing, 1898, p. 32-33). The superintendent was viewed as being able to supervise and improve the schools, and give better direction to them. "It presents worthy opportunity for the use of the noblest native abilities, or the finest training, and of the fullest stores of power" (Thwing, 1898, p. 33).

Webster (1897) explained those centrally controlled areas generally assigned to the Superintendent, when he wrote that

> The following are the most common functions assigned to him: to visit schools and consult with local officers and boards; to prepare registers and various blank forms to be used by the school officers of the State; to collect statistics concerning pupils, attendance, school taxes, etc, and receive reports from county superintendents, county examiners and various local boards; to report to the governor the condition of the public schools, the State normal schools and other educational institutions; to apportion school revenues among the different localities and frequently act as secretary of the board of commissioners of the school fund; to grant and revoke State teachers' licenses; to recommend (and frequently prescribe) textbooks, library books, courses of study, and courses of

> reading for teachers; to publish the school laws; to decide appeals and points of school law, and publish his decisions; to bring actions for recovering misapplied monies, etc [and] to act as ex-officio trustee of normal schools, regent of the State university, etc. (p. 17).

One power which was placed with the Superintendent in many of these State Superintendents was the power to appoint such position holders as "institute conductors and instructors ... county superintendents ... local boards of normal schools ... trustees ... State board of examiners...." (Webster, 1897, p. 17). What made the centralization of authority to the State Superintendent effective was the element of fear. Webster (1897) affirmed that "this subjection of local officials to State authority [was made] effective by the fear of losing the State appropriation ... and by the power of suspension and removal granted central authorities" (p. 22).

Harris (1892) pointed out that nearly every function generally deemed a part of the day-to-day operation of the public school was assigned to the superintendent of education. In the divergent series of articles appearing in the Educational Review during the early part of the 1890s, Harris (1892) noted that as the office of the superintendent had been described during its evolution as having varying functions, from those

which were janitorial in nature to that work which involved the formulation of courses of instruction (pp. 167-169).

Although centralized authority and power were supported as the Office of State Superintendent evolved, there were admonitions as well. Thwing (1898) warned the American educational community that with the office there has been a "drift in American education [all administration] ... away from democratic toward monarchical control. Absolute power is becoming lodged in the superintendent" (p. 33). Thwing's (1898) fear concerning the Office of the Superintendent was that insufficient care might be taken in appointment to that office, and that if a superintendent was appointed who lacked "such cardinal educational virtues as sympathetic appreciation, alertness to present educational conditions, knowledge of present educational problems, and a sense of the educational value of different studies, one becomes hopeless of the future of American public schools" (p. 33).

The District System Continues its Decline

Horace Mann, commenting on the 1789 law creating the decentralized school district system, had stated that the law was "the most unfortunate law on the subject of common schools ever enacted in the State of Massachusetts" (Mann in Webster, 1897, p. 23). The

adoption of such a "district system" marked the extreme of the decentralization of American schools in the first half of the nineteenth century. "The latter half of the century, on the other hand, is witnessing a very general undoing of this faulty early administrative development" (Webster, 1897, p. 25). Webster (1897) continued his analysis of the centralizing tendencies by pointing out that the general downfall of the decentralized school district system was one of the chief and important reasons for the rise of a centralized form of American educational administration (p. 25).

As the twentieth century was about to turn, the highly decentralized school district system was waning. Up until this point in time, the theory and rhetoric of school governance embraced centralized control. The practice of school governance had, however, for the most part run counter to the prevailing rhetoric and was, in fact, highly decentralized. It is at this moment in history that a shift in actual practice began to occur; in subsequent years, centralist theory and practice would increasingly coincide. Although decentralization continued an actual domination of American school governance and educational administration, all indications pointed to a real shift in control beginning to occur as the manner of administration evolved from a decentralized to a centralized one.

A rationale developed between the years 1865 and 1914 which pointed to the "evils" of a decentralized system of American educational administration. Webster (1897) identified nine disadvantages of the decentralized "school district system," and hence defined those reasons why a centralized system would serve the purposes of American school governance more effectively.

These nine reasons why a decentralized system of American school governance led to a less effective American school governance were: (1) a narrow provincialism was fostered which is detrimental to the broad focus of the centralized school administration. "The constituencies of the district officials are generally so small as to represent little more than individual caprices and prejudices rather than real public sentiment or policy" (Webster, 1879, p. 27). (2) The costs of management of the district system were becoming prohibitive. "The 'district system' is much more expensive in proportion to what it accomplishes than a more centralized system" (p. 27). (3) With a centralized system of American educational administration, the number of officials could be decreased. Webster (1879) noted that "the district system enormously increases the number of officials" needed to administer schooling (p. 27). (4) School elections cause "feuds" and "animosities." He contended

that "closely connected with the [larger number of officials required in the district system] is the increase in the number of school elections which the district system begets" (p. 28). (5) "The "district system" occasions glaring and unjust inequalities in school taxation and school privileges" (p. 28). He further suggested that centralizing the district enhances the "spirit" of school laws and taxes. (6) School policies are better enhanced with a centralized system. The "district system" prohibits "continuous and steady school policy." (7) It does not admit of any effective system of grading or classification, (8) bars out all really effective supervision and (9) fosters doungary quarrels" (Webster (1879, p. 28-29).

Martin (1894) pointed out that in the State of Massachusetts, "the battle against the district system raged in every town" (p. 207). He reviewed the rationale these centralists used in arguing against the maintenance of the traditional system of American school governance. He wrote that proponents of a centralized system argued from facts and not platitudes. These facts Martin (1984) identified as

> the instability and incompetence of the teaching force--new and unskilled teachers succeeding each other with kaleidoscopic rapidity--and the inequality of school privileges growing more marked with every increase of population in the central districts (p. 208).

There were continual attempts at abolishing the "district system" throughout the nineteenth century. Scholars, (Martin, 1894, p. 205, Webster, 1879, p. 3) point out that

> In 1849 [Martin claimed 1859] the "district system" was summarily abolished, but this law was also soon repealed. Ten years later, in 1869, the system was again abolished, but this law was practically repealed the very next year by allowing any town to reestablish the system by a two-thirds vote. Finally, however, in 1882, the system was again abolished, and this compulsory law still remains unrepealed. ...For many years, in many places, its abolition had been stoutly opposed as the entering wedge to centralization and despotism, and backwoods orators had for long eloquently appealed to the memories of Patrick Henry and the heroes of Lexington and Bunker Hill.... (Webster, 1897 p. 31).

Martin (1894) reported that gradually "One by one the towns ... regained their original sovereignty, so that when, in 1882, the final act of abolition passed ... only forty-five towns were affected" (Martin, 1894, p. 206-206). This figure is interesting because in the heyday of the highly decentralized school district system nearly every town constituted its own school district, oftentimes with more than one district in a town.

Conclusions from Reconstruction to World War I

Webster (1897) suggested that, for the most part, decentralization was the dominant theme in educational administration during the first half of the nineteenth century, but it began to wane during the middle, just prior to the advent of the American Civil War.

While centralization was the constant theme, the dominant method of American school governance remained decentralized. Highlighting the rise in prominence of centralization, Webster (1897) claims to have discovered a strong "under-current toward centralization in educational administration" (p. 78). While there was definite movement toward centralization, decentralized control continued as the rule rather than the exception. There remained, he suggested, "extreme devotion ... to the principle of local self-government" (p. 78). Even with this devotion evidenced to be the case, the desire for a more efficient, well-run educational system evolved as primary reasoning for a shift from decentralist philosophies and an embracing of more centralist attitudes. Webster (1897) suggested that

> although [American school governance has] by no means gone so far as in our commonwealth administration, yet even here education is not the only department in which this centralizing tendency can be discovered. The same tendency is every year becoming more and more evident in public health and poor-law administration, in the assessment of taxes and the auditing of local accounts (p. 78).

DeWeese (1900) argued that "the pendulum of discussion relative to the organization of school systems has vibrated between an extreme centralization of authority ... and a wide distribution of responsibility among the members of a large and unwieldy board of education" (p. 71) Society and government were becoming more and more complex. The population was increasing steadily as wave upon wave of immigrants poured into the country. In support of the centralization of governments and educational administration, Webster (1897) wrote that "this tendency is a wholesome and safe one, and our people need not be frightened by [it]" (p. 78). He further suggested that the general public should not be persuaded by decentralist proponents who attempt to scare the public with threats of a bug-bear government (p. 78). As DeWeese (1900) suggested the pendulum of educational administration continued its swing between centralization and decentralization. When that pendulum stops swinging, he stated that "it will stop somewhere ... as a plan calculated to secure the fullest measure of educational adequacy, the most economical and responsible management of school business and finance, with the greatest conformity to our democratic theory of government..." (p. 71).

The era of Reconstruction had a profound impact on American school governance and educational administration. As we have already seen, with the emancipation of over two million slaves came the mandate for the universal provision of education for them. This fact required a response at the national level, and the national government assumed much of the responsibility for securing the freed slaves right to that education. The federal government moved swiftly and enacted the First Freedman's Bureau Act and established the Bureau of Refugees, Freedmen and Abandoned Lands.

With the United States deciding to enter into World War I, a great technological push was underway. We enter now a period where the rationales for both decentralizing and centralizing changed.

CHAPTER 5

Centralization Takes a Firm Hold: American School Governance Changes

> The typical rural school is as adequately prepared to discover and meet the needs of atypical children ... as the old-fashioned country doctor is prepared to remove a tumor from the brain (Eginton, 1934, p. 522-523).

With the First World War about to begin, the United States population totalled 91,972,266. After the war's end, that population grew to 105,710,620 inhabitants. In 1920, for the first time, the rural population totalled less than fifty percent of the country's entire population, with the actual number of farm households declining to less than thirty percent of the population (Carruth, 1972, p. 454). The United States saw a steady population increase over the next twenty years with totals of 122,775,046 and 131,669,275 by 1930 and 1940 respectively (Carruth, 1972, pp. 484, 524).

Almost simultaneously with its entrance into the war, the United States experienced a great influx in immigration. New, significant technological developments highlighted the era. As we shall see, such forces as mass-production of the automobile and the school bus (transportation technologies), and the development and improvement of mass-communication technologies, significantly altered the rationale of

both centralist and decentralist advocates. The United States economy began to change drastically. The country seemed to enter a period of great prosperity in the 1920s, but later experienced an era of hard times with the Great Stock Market Crash of 1929 and the Great Depression of the 1930s. Charismatic world leaders, Theodore Roosevelt, Franklin Delano Roosevelt, V. I. Lenin, Karl Marx and Adolf Hitler, emerged, and totalitarian dictatorships assumed major roles in controlling world affairs. American national government became involved in a national scandal, the Great Teapot Dome Scandal, and led the country to the brink of the Second World War.

Educational administration changed drastically during this era. Not only does a shift in administrative dominance from decentralization to centralization occur, but also, a shift in self-image among educators from that of the professional educator to that of the business executive. As we shall see, the "scientific management" theories which dominated the business sector at the turn of the century, particularly after 1910, began to be embraced by educators as well (Callahan, 1967). As Callahan (1967) noted "All through the nineteenth century leading administrators such as Horace Mann, Henry Bernard and William T. Harris had conceived of themselves as scholars and statesmen ... after 1910, they tended to identify themselves with the

successful business executive" (p. 7-8). School district centralizations experienced a dramatic rise. The "little red schoolhouse" nearly vanished from the educational network as consolidation advocates took hold of American school governance.

World War I: The United States Becomes Involved

Woodrow Wilson said that it was a fearful thing to lead the great peaceful people of the United States into war. Beginning in 1914, the country remained "neutral" (although the country loaned money and supplies to the Triple Entente Allies--Great Britain, France and Russia). Simultaneously the United States sought to avoid any antagonism of the Central Powers (Imperial Germany, Austria-Hungary, the Ottoman Empire). This balance of seeming neutrality increased tensions between the United States and Imperial Germany. With the United States shipping arms and munitions to the Entente countries, Germany attacked American ships with submarine warfare. America threatened to cut off diplomatic relations, and the attacks temporarily came to an end. All during these years, Wilson repeatedly attempted to settle the European dispute. He failed. (Magill and Loos, 1975).

Germany's decision early in 1917 to unleash unrestricted submarine warfare on any ship bringing supplies to Great Britain or France, whether or not that

ship carried arms, significantly contributed to a deterioration in United States relations with the Central Powers. It eventually led the United States' entrance into the war on April 6, 1917 (Magill and Loos, 1975).

Great Britain waged an extensive propaganda campaign aimed at convincing the American public that this was a moral war and that the Central Powers collectively represented the antithesis of the moral right. The campaign worked, and the United States entered World War I, believing that it was entering a moral crusade. The Americans' belief that they were fighting a moral war was highlighted by Moss and Howland (1920) when they wrote:

> Imbued with the Spirit of Christianity, the Crusaders went forth to redeem the Holy Land. So too did American soldiers, crusading for Liberty and Justice, go forth to aid in redeeming the World from Prussian Militarism.
>
> For ages Pilgrims, in reverence and in memory of the deeds of the Crusaders, have made their way to the Holy Land. So too, in reverence and in memory of the deeds of their countrymen, are our people to-day visiting the American battlefields of France and Belgium (p. xi).

Wilson thought that the United States was fighting the war that would end all wars. The American forces were the deciding factor in the outcome of that war, and

it was those forces which tipped the balance of power to the side of the Entente Allies and swiftly led to the end of the conflict (Moss and Howland, 1920).

A Period of Great Prosperity: The Roaring Twenties

The decade of the 1920s brought the perception of great prosperity, astounding changes, and near destruction to the American way of life. During this ten-year span radio broadcasting firmly took hold of American culture, bringing all the world to nearly every man's door. The American people experienced the end of a war, the Dayton (Scopes) Trial, the Teapot Dome Scandal, and the Wall Street explosion, boom and crash. They learned to enjoy cross-word puzzles and dance the Charleston. With the increasing prominence of the automobile as a necessity of everyday life, the first traffic light was installed. Society in general had its villains and heroes--Al Capone and Charles A. Lindbergh. The country saw women nation-wide acquire the right to vote, and they also saw the sale of alcohol banned. Americans viewed life in the 1920s as a time to relax and enjoy life. As they did, the whole character of American culture changed, and much of the decade was dominated by the Harding presidency and its shadows (Allen, 1931, pp. xiii-14).

Warren Harding assumed the presidency with two primary assets: (1) he held the appearance of a president because he possessed a dignified air which won him the respect of the people, and (2) he was a friendly man. He also brought with him distinct liabilities, however. Chief among them were (1) a nearly total lack of discrimination in his choice of friends and advisers and (2) an inability to distinguish clearly between honesty and rascality. Ultimately these liabilities quickly backed Harding into a corner from which he could not escape, and these predicaments eventually caused his untimely death. One such situation, perhaps the most notorious, came to light just after his death. It became known as the Teapot Dome Scandal (Allen, 1931, pp. 125-136).

The Teapot Dome and Elk Hills Naval Oil Reserves were leased under questionable circumstances. As the Senate Committee on Public Lands disclosed what it found, it quickly became the most far-reaching and serious of the scandals which plagued the Harding Administration. Allen (1931) recounted the history of these oil reserves and the events which led to and culminated in this scandal. Beginning in 1909 the United States Navy began storing oil as a hedge against future shortages. The oil was stored on three tracts of land, Naval Reserve Number 1 at Elk Hills, California, Naval Reserve No 2 at Buena Vista, California, and Naval

Reserve No. 3 at Teapot Dome, Wyoming. The Navy, realizing that this stored oil might be pirated by drilling on adjacent lands and tapping the same sands, coupled with their nervousness over the possibility of conflict with Japan, decided that oil depots needed to be built and filled, to store oil for eventual conflict. The Navy's worry suited Secretary of the Interior Albert B. Fallwell. Because he represented big oil interests, Fall secretly leased the Teapot Dome reserve to Harry F. Sinclair's Mammoth Oil Company and the Elk Hills reserve to Edward F. Doheny's Pan-American Company, without competitive bidding. For these leases, Fall received from Sinclair $260,000 in Liberty Bonds and was lent by Doheny (without interest or collateral) $100,000 cash (pp. 136-139).

As a result of the Senate investigation, the Doheny and Sinclair leases were voided by the Supreme Court as being both "illegal and fraudulent," and Fall, Sinclair and Doheny were tried. Doheny was acquitted; Sinclair served a double term in prison for contempt charges because of his refusal to answer Senate questions. Secretary of the Interior Albert B. Fall was found guilty of accepting a bribe from Doheny and sentenced to a year in prison (Allen, 1931, pp. 138-139).

The 1929 Stock Market Crash: Prelude to a Depression

As the decade of the 1920s turned, the appearance of an era of great prosperity persisted. Presidents Wilson, Harding, Coolidge and Hoover felt that poverty could be eliminated. And it seemed as though the mechanisms were in motion to accomplish that dream. Allen (1931) illustrates that one of the primary means an ordinary citizen could employ to obtain riches was through investment in the Stock Market. Speculation in the Market was the rule, rather than the exception. Individuals were able to buy stocks with only a small capital expenditure, ten percent of the purchase price of a portfolio of stocks was all that was needed. The general feeling was that the common man did not need much money to become rich.

The rags to riches schemes with the market produced wealthy individuals. Risk in the purchase of stocks was minimized and the Securities Commission failed to warn adequately the general population of the dangers and potential for loss inherent with an investment in stocks. It was a bullish market with buy! buy! buy! the motto. All seemed well with the Stock Market until September, 1929. In the beginning of that month the upward spiral of stock prices broke. Stock prices plunged, but the market made a quick recovery and all seemed to be back on track. However, prices started to slide again, and by October 4, 1929 the prices of some

stocks appeared to be at bargain levels. Steel, for example, was trading at nearly 56 points lower than in previous weeks; General Electric at fifty points lower and Radio plunged from 114 3/4 to 82 1/2 points (p. 320).

Allen (1931) noted that still, in the early part of October, 1929, market analysts were reluctant to predict the doom of a market crash. Some analysts, like Roger W. Babson, argued caution, and the Standard Trade and Securities Service of the Standard Statistics Company urged clients to pursue an "ultra-conservative" investment policy. Yet there were those who refused to acknowledge that the economy was headed for destruction. The Harvard Economic Society noted that the business community was "facing another period of readjustment" but also added that should the country face a recession, the Reserve System would step in to remedy the situation and stop a full-blown recession. It was expected that the market would recover. That recovery never materialized.

On Monday, October 28, the Stock Market continued its drastic decline. For example, Steel, which already had fallen over seventy points lost an additional 17 1/2 and General Electric lost another 47 1/2 points. Still those declines were not the worst. The next day, Tuesday, October 29, 1929 proved crucial. The storm of a market crashing took on full force that day, with

literally thousands of shares appearing for trading at a time. People who once counted themselves millionaires were now considered almost penniless. The market was demoralized, brokers and their staffs exhausted. The result of that day's activities left seemingly secure stocks at desperately low levels. "The New York Times averages for fifty leading stocks had been almost cut in half" (Allen, 1931, p. 337). These stocks reached a high of 311.90 in September of 1929 and fell by November 13, 1929 to 164.34. The New York Times averages for the twenty-five leading industrial stocks plummeted even worse. These stocks fell from the September high of 469.49 to 220.95 by November, 1929.

Allen (1931) highlighted the severity of the situation when he pointed to the significant decline of some of those stocks considered prior to October 29, 1929 as most stable. Table 1 shows the result of the crash in market prices and points to the severity of the situation.

TABLE 1

Selected Stock Prices Before and After the Crash of 1929

(Adapted from Allen, 1931, p. 337)

	High Price 9/3/29	Low Price 11/13/29
American Can.....	181 7/8	86
American Telep. and Teleg...	304	197 1/4
Anaconda Copper.....	131 1/2	70
General Electric.....	396 1/4	168 1/2
General Motors.....	72 3/4	36
Montgomery Ward.....	137 7/8	49 1/4
Radio.....	101	28
Woolworth.....	100 3.8	52 1/4

The crash of the Stock Market and its aftermath eventually led to the death of the Coolidge-Hoover prosperity. A major depression followed, one in which the country experienced high unemployment and frequent bank failures. The prosperity which had been more of a state of mind than anything else ended. The Bull Market was gone. Allen (1940) summed up the monetary disaster. The crash of the stock market caused the loss of thirty billion dollars, a sum twice as large as the national debt and as much as the entire cost to the United States when it participated in World War I (p. 26). "The psychological climate was changing; the ever-shifting currents of American life were turning into new channels. The Post-war Decade had come to its close. An era had ended" (Allen, 1931, p. 338).

The Great Depression and the New Deal: The 1930s

"The heart of the story of America in the nineteen-thirties was ... the enormous economic and political transformation which took place" (Allen, 1940, p. xiv). Just as the preceding decade brought dramatic changes to American culture, so too did the decade of the thirties. During this era, the American public experienced the greatest depression that it had ever experienced, the WPA, and the Social Security Act. Bette Davis began her film career and Edgar Bergen talked to a wooden dummy, Charlie McCarthy. Charles Lindbergh's son was kidnapped

and J. Edgar Hoover rose to prominence as the head of the Bureau of Investigation of the Department of Justice (Allen, 1940, pp. 1-45).

Meanwhile, outside the territorial boundaries of the United States of America, Adolf Hitler began his ascendency to power, leading the world to the brink of a second world war, and King Edward VIII abdicated the throne of England for the love of a woman. All in all, the decade of the nineteen-thirties was a time of transition, and it began with the Great Depression (Allen, 1940, pp. 1-21).

The crash of the Stock Market plunged the nation into the largest depression in its history (Allen, 1940; Magill and Loos, 1975). During the depression era, the Gross National Product fell from $104,400,000,000 in 1929 to $74,200,000,000 by 1933. Industrial production fell a sharp fifty percent and estimates suggested that from one out of every three to one out of every four employable Americans were without work. Estimates of unemployed Americans in 1932, the "cruelest year of the Depression," ranged from 7,500,000 to 17,000,000, and the annual national income reflected these figures with nearly a sixty percent decline from $87,800,000,000 to $40,200,000,000. In addition to homes and savings being lost, American self-esteem appeared at an all-time low as the number of unemployed remained high year after year after year (Allen, 1940, pp. 45-102).

With the unemployment rate alarmingly high, Americans losing their homes, and banks continually closing, President Hoover initiated a series of measures designed to stop the economic collapse. After secretly meeting with some of the world's financial wizards, he created the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and legislated two acts, "The Home Loan Bank Act" and "The Emergency Relief and Construction Act" designed to circumvent foreclosures and provide emergency loans. Still people continued to live in "Hooverville" slums and the depression worsened. Hoover, as a result, left the presidency in seeming failure, and yet his work laid the groundwork for the eventual success of the Roosevelt Administration's "New Deal" (Allen, 1940, pp. 45-105).

Allen (1940) addressed the chief components of the "New Deal" era. He identified eight primary components of the Roosevelt plan: (1) progressive devaluation of the American dollar to 59.06 cents of its former gold value, (2) rescue of the farming population with the creation of the Agricultural Adjustment Administration and legislation aimed at raising the prices of major American farm crops by offering payment to farmers if they left a portion of their land uncultivated, (3) putting Americans back to work by stimulating employment through public works programs, (4) large scale distribution of relief funds to the unemployed, (5) development of the entire Tennessee Valley which put the

federal government directly into industry and a dominating position in the development of an entire area of the country, (6) refinancing of farm and home mortgages, with federal guarantees designed to ease the pressure on the farmers, (7) institution of financial reforms through the passage of a "Securities Act" which mandated that those who sold securities provide the government with information about those securities, and (8) the establishment of the National Recovery Administration which ultimately led to the "National Labor Relations Act" and the government's acceptance of the notion of collective bargaining. (Allen, 1940, pp. 114-121).

Recovery from the Great Depression was slow but steady. By 1937, business indexes indicated that the economy was on the upturn. It was not, however, until the advent of World War II and increased industrial production that the United States was freed from the longest depression in its history.

Adolf Hitler Leads the World to War

Events were shaping up outside the territorial boundaries of the United States which would eventually bring this country into another war. All during the nineteen-thirties, Hitler assumed more and more power and began an aggressive campaign to gain control of Germany. At the beginning of the decade, Hitler's

"Brown Shirts," screaming for the overthrow of Germany's democratic government, were little known, but they were becoming more and more powerful. When Hitler was elected Chancellor in 1933, he swiftly moved toward supreme dictatorship, and the summer of 1934 saw Hitler's "blood purge" and the assassination of Austria's Chancellor Dollfuss. By 1936, with the new Nazi German government just over three years old the European continent was already becoming alarmed. The Italian dictator, Mussolini, was shifting from opposition to Hitler to an alliance with the disciple of the totalitarian ideal. Power shifted to Berlin. That same year, Hitler entered the Rhineland and was not stopped. He swept into Austria and by summer and spring of 1938 prepared to enter Czechoslovakia. The world was on the brink of another major war (Allen, 1940, pp. 7, 48, 83, 93, 101, 171, 219-343).

All the social, economic, technological and military events of the years 1918-1943, had direct bearing on the evolution of American educational administration. As technologies increased, electricity becoming more readily available and mass transportation on a continual rise, centralized governance of education witnessed a strong, long-lasting surge.

Decentralist Defenders Speak Their Minds

The one-room school house came in for a great deal of criticism as the century turned and the United States entered into its first World War. Still, many continued to champion the cause of the "little red schoolhouse!" And in championing this cause, advocates of maintaining the decentralized system of American school governance argued that "the school was good enough for our ancestors [therefore it was] good enough for them..." (Eginton, 1934, p. 513). Advocates of the maintenance of country schools, like Clarence Poe, viewed country schools as a means whereby rural values were preserved. A loss of these schools would eventually lead to the demise of the "Farm Life Schools" which were high schools primarily concerned with training boys to become better farmers. Common city schools did not provide rural boys with the necessary background and training to become successful farmers (Poe, 1963, p. 125).

Other supporters of decentralized country schools believed that consolidation had deprived farmers of community centers and argued that the abandoned one-room country schools would become homes for vagrants. But these country school, one-room schoolhouses were on the wane. Eventually they would be all but eliminated. Still, those who advocated the maintenance of these schools ignored the fact of "mass transportation, communication, and methods of production and

distribution [that had] completely changed [the] social order from an isolated, agrarian civilization to an interdependent, industrial one" (Eginton, 1934, p. 513). Instead Aswell (1906) pointed out that general arguments against centralization and in favor of decentralization included "local custom, size of the merger, community composition, inter-community rivalry, provincialism, school patronage, public involvement and vested interests" (Maxcy, 1976, p. 221). Maxcy (1976) stated that "critics [of consolidation] predicted a depreciation in property values where schools closed, and parents feared for their children, carried far from home in potentially dangerous 'wagonettes'" (Aswell in Maxcy, 1976, p. 221).

Nevertheless, Kern (1906) argued that the future would be characterized by strong competition which will require significant technical training. "Industrial organizations with facilities for transportation never dreamed of will yet be attained. The farmer is beginning to realize that he must know something of the scientific basis upon which success in farming depends" (pp. 17-18).

Consolidation Efforts: One Case Study

Credle (1940), while briefly tracing the historical development of North Carolina school systems, pointed to that state's first plan at school consolidation, a plan

aimed at improving the state's schools. He noted that there were three primary goals for school improvement. These goals included (1) the acquisition of more money through a combination of state and local support for longer school terms and higher salaries, (2) better trained teachers, and (3) consolidation of schools and later of transportation. He argued that "quantitatively the dream of the founding educational fathers, who contemplated only one teacher schools, had been realized. Qualitatively, it is extremely doubtful that any appreciable progress had been made" (p. 28).

Lawmakers in North Carolina enacted legislation aimed at requiring that schoolhouses be located according to a "country-wide plan of organization," and that one teacher be provided for each grade at the elementary level and a minimum of three teachers in the high school. Collectively, these measures were responsible for the virtual elimination of the small schools. Continued improvement in transportation technologies afforded greater success of these measures aimed at improving schools (Credle, 1940, pp. 28-29).

Mass-Transportation Assumes a Major Role: Busing

The use of mass-transportation of students had been around for nearly 100 years. Featherston and Culp (1965) noted that Horace Mann, as early as 1838, realized the necessity of pupil transportation to and

from schools. Not all students, Mann suggested, could live within walking distance to schools. As early as 1869, Massachusetts voters authorized the levy of a tax for the support of public transportation. At first the vehicles used to transport students were privately owned ones, either wagons or carriages. It was not until the early 1920s that the "schoolbus," a motorized vehicle, became officially the method of public school pupil transportation (Culp, 1971, pp. 276-278).

Blose (1936) pointed to the reliance of the use of mass-transportation of students in consolidated systems. He noted the "conviction [continued] to grow that the State owes every child an opportunity to secure an education and if the child lives beyond walking distance from the school it should be transported at public expense" (p. 223). In noting the increase in student transportation necessitated by school consolidations, Blose (1936) noted that "in 1933-34 there were 2,794,724 pupils transported in 77,042 vehicles provided at public expense. The number of pupils transported ... is over three times as great as it was during the year 1923-24" (p. 223).

Centralization: An Evolving Rationale

Consolidation of schools, and therefore American educational administration, provided those boys and girls enrolled in the nation's schools with the "best of

everything," which placed them educationally well-above those who were not afforded the benefits of consolidated school systems. "Educational programs have been so much enriched and broadened that millions of boys and girls are enrolled in schools which try to provide the 'best of everything' " (Eginton, 1934, p. 513).

When Skidmore (1938) studied Utah's consolidation efforts, he noted the significant progress made in that state's school districts because of consolidation. Skidmore (1938) argued eight reasons why centralization of educational administration proved beneficial not only to the State but to society as a whole. He noted that consolidated efforts produced (1) improvement in economic management, (2) schools free from political manipulation and influence, (3) equalization of tax burdens among taxpayers, (4) more efficient curriculum offerings, (5) increased efficiency among school board members, teachers and educational administrators, (6) greater specialization of instruction, (7) increases in attendance, enrollment and graduating classes, (8) the establishment of high schools, junior colleges, and educational and social centers where community members might gather and participate (p. 18).

Eginton (1934) identified several reasons why decentralization, and hence a lack of school consolidation, deprived American school children of many educational benefits which might otherwise be afforded

them. He stated that those who sought to perpetuate the one-room school and a decentralized system of American school governance argued that the school system (1) was good enough for their forefathers and therefore good enough for them; and (2) offered an opportunity to those who attended these schools to acquire enough education to "till the soil and operate the country store" (p. 513-514). He highlighted the disadvantages of decentralized school systems, calling to the attention of contemporary educators six reasons why a decentralized school system could not provide an adequate education for the nation's school-age population.

> First, there are those who maintain the school was good enough for our ancestors is good enough for them in spite of the fact that modern transportation [and] communication ... have completely changed our social order from an isolated, agrarian civilization to an interdependent, industrial one.
>
> Second, one-room rural schools have served to perpetuate isolated, more or less sufficient community centers which wish to close their eyes to the fact that such modern inventions as the automobile, radio and press today have practically conquered time and distance...
>
> Third, the vicissitudes and hardships of transportation have loomed up so gigantic [sic] that they have prevented many from thinking calmly and carefully about the complex problems of educational philosophy.
>
> Fourth, consolidated schools are generally more expensive than the antiquated one-room schools.

> Fifth, there has rightly been much criticism of consolidated schools. No one can correctly say that consolidated schools are doing better work than rural schools.
>
> Sixth, there has been a tendency to discuss advantages and disadvantages in vague, general terms rather than indicate ... scientifically and definitely ... why it is utterly impossible to provide as rich, balanced educational program in the one-room rural school (pp. 513-515).

Consolidation was unquestionably taking hold of American school governance. Blose (1936) defined a consolidated school as one which was "usually considered to be a school formed by closing a number of smaller schools and bringing those together into a single larger school" (p. 223). He noted that one indication of continued school consolidations was revealed in the number of teaching positions available. "There were 836,562 teaching positions in 1933-34 which is fewer than in the two preceding biennial reports but more than in any year before" (p. 223). Chief among the reasons why these figures changed from the figures for the decade of the 1920s was (1) the consolidation of small rural schools and transporting pupils to larger schools, (2) fewer kindergarten teachers, and (3) a retrenchment in salary expenditures by not filling all positions as they became vacant (p. 223).

The Expenses of Consolidation: Cost Effective?

While consolidation was the general trend, Little (1934) studied the cost of consolidated schools in Georgia and argued that the process remained a slow one. He noted that, as of 1934, there were still 150,000 one-teacher schools in the United States, yet there had been a significant increase in the number of consolidated schools during the decade of the 1920s. "The number of consolidated schools increased from 11,890 in 1920 to 17,004 in 1930. This is slow growth" (p. 24). Little's study revealed reorganization of schools into consolidated units resulted in a decrease in cost by 7.8 per cent, but if rural schools are included, the mean average decrease in expenditure rose to 9.2 per cent. He argued that "because rural children must be taken to school before they can be taught, rural schools will always cost more than the same number of pupils would cost in city schools" (p. 24).

While Little (1934) determined that school consolidation, at least on the surface, cost more, a similar study in Washington State proved the opposite to be true. In 1937, the number of school districts in Washington State were cut in half with many costly small school districts eliminated. Through this effort at consolidation, the state realized over a $2,000,000 savings. Besides the monetary savings from school consolidations, the curriculum was enriched and the

entire operation of American educational administration made more efficient (School progress, 1937, p. 30).

Blose (1936) reported that the trend toward school consolidation continued during the decade of the 1930s, and he presented quantitative documentation to support his claim. "In spite of much retrenchment in public-school activities, the number of consolidated schools continues to increase" (Blose, 1936, p. 223). The total number of consolidated schools reported was 17,248, with sixteen states reporting the addition of 400 new consolidated schools.

The Financing of Public School Education: Taxation

George Strayer (1934) traced the history of the evolution of American educational administration for New York State as it related to the State's obligation to support public education. In his analysis, he noted that the state gradually increased its central control over education by the effective use of tax dollars. During the nineteen-twenties and the early nineteen-thirties, New York revised its system of support for education so that by 1930 the state's share of the financing of education rose to thirty-one per cent of the total cost for public elementary and secondary schooling. Additionally, the idea of who held the responsibility of funding public education came under scrutiny both by the State Legislature and educators as

well. The State commissioned the Educational Finance Inquiry, which, in part, concluded that

> The state should insure equal educational facilities to every child within its borders at a uniform effort throughout the state in terms of the burden of taxation; the tax burden of education should throughout the state be uniform in relation to tax-paying ability, and the provision for schools should be uniform in relation to the educable population desiring education (Strayer, 1934, p. 583).

The general idea touted by the Commission was that there needed to exist some central control at the state level over educational financing. Simultaneously, the Davenport Committee and the Friedsam Commission were dealing with the problem of taxation for educational support.

A Special Joint Committee on Taxation and Retrenchment convened to address the subject of remedial tax legislation. Its first chair was Frederick M. Davenport, for whom the committee was named. The Committee's recommendations followed closely those of the Educational Finance Inquiry and supported the research undertaken for the measurement of educational need by Dr. Paul R. Mort. The end result of the Committees' recommendations resulted in the 1925 Cole Law. This law was the most important legislative act for the support of the schools passed from the beginning of the free school movement to 1925 (Strayer, 1934).

Michael Friedsam chaired the Friedsam Commission, appointed by Governor Alfred E. Smith in 1925. This commission concerned itself with (1) state and local taxation for school support; (2) methods of apportionment of state aid for public schools; (3) educational administration of the funds generated by tax dollars; and (4) legal ramifications of capital outlay and bonded indebtedness. The resulting legislation evolving from the Commission amended the Cole Law by increasing state aid while preserving the equalization provision of that law (Strayer, 1934, p. 584).

Strayer (1934) explained the rationale for the state centralizing control over educational administration and support when he stated that "any attempt to propose the program of education which the state is obligated to provide today must take into account the contrast between that earlier society and our modern, interdependent, industrial, urbanized society" (p. 586). He claimed that in prior times, support was supplemented to a larger extent by families and local communities. Shifts in geographical population patterns and technological advancement mandated a shift in control and funding of American education and educational administration.

While Paul R. Mort's research on the measurement of educational need was used as a basis for New York state's Educational Finance Inquiry Committee's

recommendations, Mort (1934) expressed some concern over these centralizing tendencies. He asserted that these tax controlling measures served to undermine local initiative, which he considered a strike "at the very heart of educational progress" (p. 573). A shift from the decentralized local control of American school governance to the centralized state control through the use of state tax funds engendered three primary threats to undermining local initiative.

Mort (1934) identified these threats, stating that centralized control over expenditures mandated that (1) essential educational programs had to be defined in minute detail in order to determine which educational services could be eliminated; (2) with final control over educational budgets placed under the control of centralized bodies, limitations were placed on the expenditures or taxes which local communities were allowed to make; and (3) a "gradual hamstringing of local initiative by the increased disproportionate burdens would be thrown upon the property tax" (pp. 573-574).

Consolidation Advocates List its Specific Advantages

Advocates of the centralization of American educational administration argued at least ten advantages to school consolidation efforts. Eginton (1934) identified these reasons as he argued in support

of school consolidation. School consolidation made possible the provision for a modern building with sufficient health services. The rural schools did not provide the necessary health facilities, sufficient lighting, and the creature comforts that a consolidated effort could provide (Eginton, 1934).

Eginton (1934) and Cillie (1940) pointed out that centralized systems act as a stimulus toward greater efficiency. Consolidated school systems could better provide their students with the necessary equipment, rooms, learning materials and staff services at much more reasonable cost. Consolidated efforts allowed for the purchase of a minimum amount of equipment and made more accessible to the rural student such educational necessities as a well-equipped library with comfortable reading facilities usually under the direction of a librarian; a well-equipped gymnasium which would assist in the provision of a more balanced and broader educational program; an auditorium large enough to hold assemblies of the entire student population; an area in which to conduct art and music classes; an ample supply of the relatively expensive classroom items such as microscopes, maps, globes and musical instruments; and an ability to meet the needs and capacities of different children.

Third, consolidation of schools allowed for satisfactory grouping of students. With consolidation, atypical children could be better cared for; the socialization process would be better facilitated and richer, deeper learning experiences would be afforded the student population.

Fourth, students could be more effectively socialized in a broader, richer environment. Eginton (1934) wrote that "in order to develop proper social attitudes, habits, graces and technics, ... [the student] must be provided the opportunity to make literally millions of liberating, social adjustments" (p. 519).

Fifth, in a consolidated school environment, the pupil is better stimulated in the larger social group. Students work best when they know that their work and behavior is being observed by many other peers. If the student in the rural school remained "stranded in an isolated, broken-down shack which often has no more aesthetic beauty than old Dobbin, they are very likely to unlax..." (Eginton, 1934, p. 521).

A sixth advantage to school consolidation lies in its ability to meet the special needs of atypical children. "The rural school is as adequately prepared to discover and meet the needs of atypical children--slow learning, physically handicapped, crippled, emotionally unstable, mentally handicapped, melancholic,

phobic ... as the ... country doctor is prepared to remove a tumor of the brain" (Eginton, 1934, p. 521-522).

Eginton's (1934) seventh advantage for school consolidation lies with enhancement of teaching. The teacher can stimulate and guide activities more effectively in a consolidated situation. He suggested that any teacher does better with children grouped according to chronological age.

The supervision of the teacher plays a key role in providing the eighth advantage for consolidated schools. Teacher/teacher interaction is greatly facilitated if there are many teachers working in the same location. Eginton suggested that with teachers working in close proximity, they would get together to meet and to generally "cross-fertilize the schools with valuable ideas, worthwhile professional literature such as current magazines and books ... and are more accessible to work in groups" (p. 523).

Eginton's (1934) ninth advantage to a consolidation of schools aligns itself with the concept of attitudinal improvement. He suggests that better community attitudes are fostered when educational efforts are joined. Collective group support breeds a healthier community attitude toward the school, its governance and the educational process.

Concluding Eginton's argument highlighting the advantages of a consolidated school system, he points to a singular advantage upon which many, he felt, could agree is of prime concern. Through a consolidation of educational effort, better and more competent faculties could be attracted and retained.

The African-American and the Separate School: Decentralization

By 1935 there were over four million school age Negro children in the United States. Four-fifths of these children were taught by approximately forty-eight thousand Negro teachers in separate schools from the white children. There were, by this time, less than 500,000 Negro children attending "mixed" schools, and these schools were located primarily in the North where these children were taught almost exclusively by white teachers (Du Bois, 1935, p. 328).

W. E. Burghardt Du Bois (1935) addressed the issue of whether or not the consolidated educational system of the United States applied where education of the Negro child was concerned. Du Bois was concerned that these children receive the best possible education and emphatically stated that separate schools were necessary only "so far as they are necessary for the proper

education of the Negro race. The proper education of any people includes sympathetic touch between teacher and pupil" (p. 328).

Du Bois identified four specific reasons for the separation of schooling for black Americans. He noted that for education of any child to be successful there must be (1) understanding between teacher and pupil; (2) knowledge on the part of the teacher of the students heritage, class, and background; (3) social contact between pupil and pupil and teacher and pupil reflecting social equality; and (4) facilities for extra-curricular activities which prepare the student for life outside the school environment. "The plain fact faces us, that either [the Negro child] will have separate schools or he will not be educated" (Du Bois, 1935, pp. 328-329).

The crux of Du Bois's argument was not that separate schools should, by necessity, exist for the Negro child, but that schools exist at all. "To sum up this: theoretically the Negro needs neither segregated schools nor mixed schools. What he needs is Education" (p. 335). While school consolidations applied, generally, to white and "mixed" schools, separate facilities of a decentralized nature seemed to be the answer to the education of the Negro child. He concluded his argument for culling out the educational

process for black America with the assertion that "Sympathy, Knowledge, and the Truth, outweigh all that the mixed school can offer" (p. 335).

Conclusions to the Centralizing Period

For the first time in its history, American school governance actually experienced the dominance of a centralist over decentralist philosophy in its organization and administration for the majority of the time period covered. Proponents of the centralization of control over American educational administration were not only more vocal, but were more successful in establishing the dominance of their philosophy. The fact of a shift in the geographical centers of population from rural to urban; significant technological advancements including mass-communication, mass-transportation and electricity; and increasing pressure from centralized state agencies fostered centralization's dominance over American school governance.

Numerous scholars (Allen, 1931; Allen 1940; Aswell, 1906; Maxcy, 1976; Kern, 1906; Credle, 1940; Culp, 1971; Eginton, 1934; Skidmore, 1938;) have identified the major arguments favoring the centralization of control over American school governance and educational administration. The most pervasive reasons argued for the adoption of centralized control were (1) increased

technology required the farmer to acquire knowledge of the scientific bases upon which successful farming depended; (2) the heavy use of the school bus, which came to prominence in the early nineteen-twenties provided safe, dependable transportation for pupils in rural areas; (3) consolidation of efforts was cost effective; (4) a conviction on the part of the public that the state owed an education to all children; (5) consolidation of efforts provided the "best of everything" to school age children through improvement in management, the elimination of political manipulation, and the equalization of the tax burdens; and (6) teacher/teacher interaction allowed for better, fuller professional growth of the teacher.

There were those who argued for the maintenance of the decentralized system of American school governance. Chief among those who argued for continued decentralized control were scholars Poe, 1963; Aswell, 1906; Mort, 1934; Du Bois, 1938. The primary arguments which centered around a decentralist philosophy were (1) continuation because of local custom; (2) inter-community rivalry; (3) school patronage; (4) vested interest in the schools on the part of the public. Additionally, Poe (1963) perpetuated the argument that what was good enough for our ancestors should be good enough for us.

Paul Mort's (1934) decentralist argument relied on the concept of local initiative. He expressed fear that centralized control over budgets by taxation would undermine local initiative, yet he recognized the necessity for state support for public education. With a clear centralizing movement carrying American school governance through the decades of the 1920s and 1930s, the country, after experiencing another two wars experienced national involvement in American educational administration and school governance. The United States federal government then assumed a major centralizing role in school control.

CHAPTER 6

Social Pressures Come to Bear as the Roots of Centralization Deepen

> Change does not just begin at a point in time; it builds on history.
> (Lewis, 1964)

During the forty years between 1940 and 1980, the American public witnessed significant technological advances and entered into a period of international governmental competition to "conquer" outer-space, land a man on the moon, and become the strongest international power. With much attention placed on education and its improvement, the national government strengthened its authority in the governance of American educational administration. Presidents Dwight D. Eisenhower, John F. Kennedy, Lyndon B. Johnson, and James E. Carter sought to mandate and legislate educational policy. Centralization at the national level played a significant shaping role in the evolution of American school governance as localities and states lost a measurable amount of control over their educational programs and their administration. Key factors which aided in determining the central course of American educational administration included issues of civil rights, segregation and integration, the separate but equal doctrine, enhancement programs such as the

Head Start Program, and busing. The primary goal of both centralization (national government) and decentralization (state's rights) advocates was the universal provision of education to all the American people and the manner in which that goal would be best accomplished.

During this period in American history, the United States would enter two wars (World War II and the Korean War) and one highly controversial and unpopular "conflict" (the Viet Nam Conflict). A senator from Wisconsin, Joseph R. McCarthy, would signal a paranoia about communism and reflect the fear of many in the country as he spearheaded a congressional investigation into charges that the Communist party was active in both government and the entertainment industries. Nearly ten years later, the United States would face that same Communist party in a confrontation over military might on the small island of Cuba in the conflict known as the "Cuban Missile Crisis." Americans would witness one president's assassination (John F. Kennedy) and the attempted assassination of two other presidents (Gerald R. Ford and Ronald Reagan). Baby Boomers (children born after the end of World War II) would mature and flood the nation's public and private schools and cries for educational reform would increasingly grow louder. The mission of the school additionally evolved as it viewed

its responsibilities not only for the provision of education, but also as guardians of the nation's school age children's health. Polio would soon become a non-threatening disease as by 1956 the Salk Vaccine would be administered at the schools to the nation's children. American school governance and American national governance became more closely intertwined as the federal government reformulated its relationship with the educational community.

Centralizing Tendencies: An Overview 1940-1980

While scholars (Cronin, 1973; Tyack, 1974) suggest that centralization evolved as the dominant manner of American school governance during the nineteenth century, actual statistical data indicate that centralization ascended to dominance during the period between 1940 and 1980. Table 2 highlights the rapid centralization of school districts during the twentieth century. These data point to the drastic decline in the total number of school districts in the United States and clearly show the significance of the tendencies of school districts to consolidate.

TABLE 2

Fifty Years of School District Consolidation

YEAR	NUMBER OF DISTRICTS	PERCENT INCREASE/DECREASE
1932	127,108	n/a
1942	108,579	-15%
1952	67,346	-38%
1962	34,678	-49%
1972	15,781	-54%

(Compiled from issues of: Statistical Abstracts of the United States, 1913-1990 and Historical Statistics of the United States Colonial Times to 1970)

Table 2 demonstrates that, between 1932 and 1942, there was a 15% decline in the total number of school districts in the United States, with the number of eliminated school districts totaling 18,529. While this number is significant, it appears negligible when analyzing the decline in the total number of districts for the next thirty years. From 1942 to 1952, there were 41,233 districts consolidated representing an additional 38% decline, and even greater rates of decline occurred in the subsequent twenty years.

These decreases seem almost staggering. However, in 1958, the American Association of School Administrators pointed out that there were still too many school districts in the United States, and called for further centralization of districts. The Association identified four primary reasons why consolidation efforts needed to be continued. One of its publications, The Point of Beginning, explained its stand, stating that there were too many school districts because

> only about 1 district out of every 8 [was] large enough to employ as many as 40 teachers; more than 3 out of every 4 districts employ[ed] 10 teachers or less; more than half of all the districts in the country operate[d] elementary schools only; and there are thousands of districts that operate no schools at all (AASA, The Point of Beginning, 1958, p. 4).

The country seemed to heed the advice and warnings of the Association because the total number of school districts in the United States continued its decline as the number of school district consolidations increased.

From 1952 to 1962 there was a 49% decline in the total number of school districts in the United States. During this ten year period, an additional 32,668 districts were merged with other districts. While this number is significant, school district consolidations peaked for the period reported in 1972 when 54% of the remaining districts merged. Of the 34,678 school districts in existence in the United States in 1962, only 15,781 remained by 1972 as 18,897 additional school districts consolidated.

It is interesting to note, however, that the American Association of School Administrators (1962) pointed out that of the 34,687 school districts which remained operational "in 1961, 4,677 legally constituted school districts ... did not operate a school" (AASA, 1962, p. 1).

If one required further corroboration of the significance of the movement toward centralization, an overview of the fifty-year trend toward consolidation proves enlightening. Between the years 1932 and 1972, 111,327 school districts were consolidated into 15,781

independent districts. These numbers represent an 89% decline in the number of school districts for the period under discussion.

Additionally, the number of one-teacher schools significantly declined over the period from 1930 to 1961. Table 3, Number and Percent of Increase\Decrease in One-Teacher Schools is drawn from the Association of School Administrators, School District Organization (1962).

TABLE 3

Number and Percent of Increase\Decrease in One-Teacher Schools

YEAR	NUMBER OF SCHOOLS	PERCENT INCREASE/DECREASE
1930	148,711	N/A
1948	74,832	-49.68%
1961	15,018	-79.93%

(Source: AASA, School District Organization, 1962, p. 5)

Table 3 demonstrates that the number of one-teacher schools continued its decline with an almost eighty-percent reduction in the number of those schools by 1961. In fact, AASA reported that the number of one-teacher schools actually declined at a faster pace than did the decline in the total number of school districts throughout the United States (AASA, 1962, p. 4-6).

The Community Administrative Unit: Some Views

By the end of World War II, scholars (Gregg, 1948; Butterworth, 1948, Chase, 1948; and Kimball, 1948) addressed that which they considered the most basic problem with public education--that of the development of local school districts which provided modern educational programs and services in the most economical ways. They identified immediate educational problems, and a dialogue developed concerning their improvement. Such issues as curriculum modification, adequate guidance programs, transportation of pupils, and equalization of the support of education consistently came to the forefront. The general consensus was that improvement in these educational needs, hence, educational reform, could be satisfactorily resolved through consolidation in school district organization.

Of primary concern in American school governance and educational administration in the late nineteen-forties was the adoption of criteria for the

establishment of a satisfactory administrative unit which would provide the educational facilities demanded by the American people for their children (Butterworth in Gregg, 1948, p. 15).

Butterworth (1948) identified four criteria which needed to be met before an administrative unit was considered to be satisfactory for selection. He asserted that

> (1) Such an administrative district should have a sufficient number of pupils that it can maintain a satisfactory program economically.
>
> (2) The territory included in such a district should be that within which citizens may work together on their educational and other problems.
>
> (3) The districts should be organized in accordance with accepted principles, i.e., there would be one board of education to represent the people in the administrative unit.
>
> (4) The territory in the administrative district should have enough wealth, which, with aids from the state or other governmental unit, such as the county, will enable the district to offer the desired program at a tax rate roughly comparable to that paid by school districts throughout the state (p. 15-17).

As we shall see, there were constant arguments for the consolidation of administrative units into units which were considerably larger than the community district which oftentimes reached consolidation of educational administration to the county level. However, as early as 1948, there were those who argued the advantages of the community administrative unit.

Chase (1948) wrote that "there can be no question that in many states ... the general adoption of community administrative units would represent a long step forward" (p. 19). In his argument for the advantages of consolidation only to the community level he first defined a community:

> The term "community" is used here to mean a unit of social organization larger than the neighborhood. It usually consists of a number of neighborhoods surrounding a town or village which is the chief service center for the community. It is to the community center that people go for food, clothing, drugs, farm machinery, and other supplies .... Usually one may find in the community center the offices of one or more doctors, dentists, and lawyers. In the community center one expects to find, also, a high school (p. 19).

In building his case for adoption of the community administrative unit, Chase (1948) highlighted those chief advantages for the selection of the community unit as the chief administrative unit for American educational administration. He identified five distinct advantages to the adoption of the community administrative unit as the method for administration of the school system. These five advantages were that: (1) community units so organized would be larger units, (2) these units would enable richer program development and more educational services, (3) the community unit would be able to offer a 12-year program of public education, (4) this type of unit promises better and

more effective educational leadership, and (5) control of American school governance would remain close to the people with the community feeling a responsibility for the provision of a sound education for the children of the community.

Chase (1948) compared the community administrative unit with larger administrative units. Essentially, he claimed that all those benefits realized by the educational community with the adoption of the community administrative unit could, in fact, be obtained with the adoption of larger units, such as those at the county level. "Substantially, every advantage," he wrote, "that has been claimed for the community administrative unit can be obtained within the larger district, provided each community center is given a school which can meet community needs" (Chase, 1948, p. 21). He cites as the main objection to the adoption of a unit of educational administration larger than the community level a lack of responsiveness to the community's needs. He rationalized, however, that this defect in units larger than the community unit would be a result of weak, ineffective leadership rather than an inherent disadvantage of the larger unit per se.

In addition to the lack of responsiveness of larger administrative units, Chase (1948) pointed out other disadvantages of their adoption. Among those reasons were (1) the mutilation of communities engendered by a

lack of flexibility on the part the larger unit to the individual community's needs, (2) potential interference by the larger unit in the proper development of the community, (3) potential interference with the effective administrative control of the community administrative unit, and (4) loss of involvement by the community in shaping school policies (Chase, 1948, p. 22).

School District Reorganization: Consolidation

Consolidation became the catch-word. Across the nation, districts were consolidating. Punke (1945) recounted a four-year period of school consolidation efforts in the rural community of Bogart, Georgia. He claimed that in addition to allowing for improved schooling and more efficient use of education dollars, the rural consolidated school fostered strong community involvement. Punke's centralist rationale closely paralleled decentralist arguments as he reasoned that consolidation fostered greater community involvement and participation.

Chase (1948) used an interesting juxtaposition of dialogue to analyze pro and con elements of school consolidation efforts. In utilizing this discussion method he assuages some of the myths about the "detrimental" effects of school consolidation. He pointed out that as a result of consolidation efforts, which produced improvement in educational services and

facilities, the entire educational process became more effective.

Gregg (1948) identified several basic reasons why consolidation of smaller school districts into larger ones was important. Drawing from his knowledge of the Wisconsin public school system, he asserted that thousands of school districts could not provide the modern educational program and services necessary for children and youth, a poor quality of education was offered, and the education that was provided was done so at an excessively high cost per pupil.

Humphreys (1952) examined the administrative aspect of school district consolidation efforts. She identified three significant areas which existed as potential problems in school consolidation efforts: human relations, teacher-principal relationships and home-school relationships. One primary drawback to consolidation efforts is the flexibility of the administrator of the consolidated school areas. She contended that if the administrator was either rigid or undemocratic, problems with the consolidation effort would result.

Additionally, the Association of School Administrators (1958) identified resistance to school district consolidation efforts. The Association reported that "Such resistance is often expressed [as a] fear that:

*Local control will be destroyed

*The school plant will be taken out of the neighborhood and ; [sic] the children transported too far away from home

*Parental influence on the children will be seriously weakened

*School taxes will increase

*The close relationships between the home and the school which have long been maintained in the smaller unit will be destroyed

*Children will be injured in school transportation

*The community itself will be seriously weakened or destroyed through school district reorganization (pp. 9-10).

Harris (1953) reported on school district reorganization in Caldwell County, Texas. He claimed that in spite of the usual resistance, the Caldwell County, Texas school district was able to reduce the number of districts from twenty-seven to nine. This task was accomplished in four years. To successfully accomplish this consolidation reorganization, the County developed a comprehensive plan to educate the general public on the educational needs of the community. The necessary information was brought to the community via town meetings. In these meetings the advantages of school district consolidation were highlighted as committee members discussed the problems currently confronting the school districts. From their preliminary study the committee informed the community

of the immediate problems facing the County's school districts. These problems were (1) the size of the district, (2) the tax base and tax rate, (3) the number of teachers and their qualifications, (4) core course offerings, (5) pupil attendance, (6) building, transportation and facilities costs. District consolidation, the Committee recommended would solve these problems.

Advocates of reorganization through centralization related five primary advantages to district consolidation. The reasons which supported consolidation efforts were: (1) a broadening of the tax base used to support education, (2) more effective use of transportation with subsequent reductions in overall transportation costs, (3) the manner in which abandoned school buildings could be utilized, and (4) maintenance of elementary schools.

In Ohio, consolidation was called a "merger." Jacobson (1968) discussed the merger of three "small" high schools in Athens, Ohio. This merger allowed for a more efficient use of school funds and provided an opportunity to develop a richly varied curriculum. Jacobson (1968) claimed that the success of this centralization effort was due, in large part, to the inclusion in the decision-making process of all those directly affected by the merger. Parents and teachers, as well as administrators, all had input into the

decision to consolidate. "Change" he wrote, "can best be accomplished when those who will be affected by the change are centrally involved in planning the change" (p. 26). Noticeably missing from inclusion in the decision making process are those most directly affected by a merger--the students.

During the same year that Ohio was merging, Kentucky was consolidating its schools. Hovermale (1968) reported that Estill County, Kentucky was consolidating its two separate school systems. The result of centralizing services and administration was a modern high school building complex, facilities necessary to offer a comprehensive program to all students of the county, and greater savings to the tax payer.

Mullins (1973) pointed out that, although school district consolidation efforts throughout the United States were slowing, the odds were two to one that everyone would be affected by them. She claimed that proponents of school district consolidation movements considered "anything more than 5,000 operating school districts in this country ... [meant] inefficiency and second-rate schooling" (p. 24).

Mullins (1973) addressed the issues surrounding the centralization versus decentralization debate and in doing so presented an almost equal number of supporting arguments for both methods of American educational

administration. She also predicted the necessity of an additional sixty-six per cent decline in the number of school districts before the school district consolidation movement completely succeeded.

Mullins (1973) pointed to these reasons why proponents argued in favor of school district consolidation: (1) consolidation was more economical and led to a more efficient administration with reductions in administrative staff, facilities and teachers; (2) consolidation eliminated the confusion and lack of articulation created by separate elementary and secondary school districts; (3) consolidation into a district of one unit of K-12 eliminated hodgepodge and enabled the district to provide continuity of curriculum throughout the students primary educational program; (4) the quality of educational services received by every child would be the same; and (5) consolidation reduced the inequities of rich and poor neighborhoods by equalizing communities ability to offer similar educational opportunities to all school-age children.

While Mullins (1973) felt that these arguments lent support to the school district consolidation movement, she also identified those arguments in support of decentralization movements as well. "Valid arguments are these," she wrote "and ... consolidation has been effected on the basis of one or more of them. ... [T]he

reservations ... of those opposed to consolidation can be equally valid and frighteningly real" (p. 25).

However, although suburban and rural areas found that they benefited through centralizing administration and facilities, the opposite proved to be true in major urban areas. In fact, decentralization of school districts was the rule rather then the exception in major metropolitan areas such as New York City, Chicago and Detroit. Mullins (1973) pointed out that in these areas decentralization was preferable to centralization of school districts because bigger did not necessarily mean better, monetary savings realized could be virtually wiped out by the creation of a monolithic bureaucracy, larger class sizes meant loss of individual attention afforded students in decentralized systems. The greatest of all reasons for maintenance of a decentralized system of educational administration was the continued efforts at maintaining local control.

Education as a Function of the State

There were those (Gregg, 1948; Iannaconne and Lutz, 1970) who argued that education was a function of state. Gregg (1948) boldly stated that "education is a state function" (p. 1). He contended that the legislature, which represented the people, had the responsibility to control all public schools and public school districts. He wrote that "school districts [were] the creation of

the legislature in its efforts to meet its constitutional responsibility. They [were] the means by which the distribution of a free public education [was] accomplished in the local communities" (Gregg, 1948, p. 1).

By the end of World War II, the educational responsibilities of the state through the various state legislatures were identified as

> (1) adopting general policies for the development of public education; (2) equalizing educational opportunities among the communities of the state; (3) distributing the cost of education equitably among the people of the state; and (4) maintaining a school district structure capable of providing in each community a quality educational program at economical cost per pupil (Gregg, 1948, p. 1-2).

Chief among Gregg's (1948) concerns was that the small school district had out-lived its functionality and usefulness. He wrote that "the very small district with its one-room rural school within walking distance of the children's home was appropriate to the times. Times have changed... " (p. 2). With increased technological advancement, the ability to transport pupils economically improved tremendously. Those aspects of contemporary educational administration which led to a call for restructuring district administration and organization were issues such as the notions that an education at least to the high school level was considered a necessity, the modern school was markedly

different from the school of fifty years previously, and transportation facilities had improved dramatically. As a direct result of these developments, the common school district organization quickly became outmoded (Gregg, 1948, p. 2).

Iannaconne and Lutz (1970) noted that education was a state function which was locally administered. These scholars characterized the local school districts as the "state's arm" whose chief charge was the administration of the state's education policies.

The National Government Centralizes Control

In 1958, the American Association of School Administrators was quick to point out that advancements in the fields of science and economics had caused the people of the United States to critically examine what their schools had done and were doing for the provision of education at both elementary and secondary levels. The Association noted that the President of the United States, Dwight D. Eisenhower, evidenced this concern in his 1958 "State of the Union" address, where he admonished the people of the United States to work to develop "the intellectual capital" needed for the years ahead. His words were the result of a heightened awareness of the global educational competition brought to the forefront by the recent technological superiority evidenced by the Soviet Union with its space age

technology. The successful launch of the Soviet Union's "Sputnik #1" satellite brought this concern to the forefront (American Association of School Administrators, The Point of Beginning, 1958, pp. 3-5).

Scholars, (Witkin, 1958; Killian, 1977; Durant, 1981) wrote of the American public's reaction to the revelation of Soviet scientific superiority with its launch of the Sputnik #1 satellite. Witkin (1958) stated that "the United States, singularly unfestive as it rang in the new year 1958, was a nation in shock ... [as the nation] ... soon realized that Russia had beaten the United States into space" (pp. 3-4). The event captured the attention of the entire nation to the extent that President Eisenhower seized the opportunity to use the Russian scientific and technological superiority to attempt to sway Southern support for integration of its public high schools. In a letter to Bishop R. Brown of Arkansas, Eisenhower stated that "today the very concepts of freedom are under relentless attack ... If we ... defy the instruments by which our liberties have been ... preserved, our vulnerability to the outside threat will be vastly ... increased" (Witkin, 1958, p. 18).

Clare Booth Luce (1958), in writing of the national Sputnik reaction, called on the South to end its segregationist attitude. She wrote that

> We implore our Southern neighbors--and those in the North who agree with their stands on segregation and integration--if they will not lift their eyes to the highest heaven, at least to lift them as high as the Sputnik. For that moon raises the real question: the question all Americans must soon answer. The question is not whether Central High will be peacefully integrated, but whether it--and every other Central High in America-will be violently disintegrated--disintegrated by the warheads of which Sputnik itself is merely a pioneer (Luce in Witkin, 1958, p. 18).

Eisenhower (1958), in a speech in Oklahoma City, addressed the notion of public educational advancement and a centralization of control over that effort. He stated that as a nation,

> We should, among other things, have a system of nation-wide testing of high school students; a system of incentives for high-aptitude students to pursue scientific or professional studies; a program to stimulate good-quality teaching of mathematics and science; provision of more laboratory facilities, and measures, including fellowships, to increase the output of qualified teachers (Eisenhower in Witkin, 1958, p. 40).

In writing retrospectively of the public's reaction to the Sputnik #1 episode in American history, Killian (1977) concluded that a major industrial power can achieve almost any technological feat it can conceive of, provided only that it is willing to concentrate its energies and resources on that goal" (p. 6). The end result of the public reaction to Sputnik #1 and Russian

scientific and technological superiority was the continuing centralization over American school governance and educational administration for the next twenty years.

The Second American Revolution: The 1950s and 1960s

The decade of the nineteen-fifties marked nearly constant social upheaval. The end of the decade witnessed, for the first time in America, tense conflict over racial integration and fierce encounters over school desegregation. Lewis (1964) wrote that few scholars could have predicted at the end the fifties that the stereotype of the apathetic, satisfied Negro would forever disappear, that the indifference of white America would yield to sympathy and admiration for the fervor and courage of the new Negro, and that the Federal Government would abandoned its hands-off attitude of nearly eighty years, and embrace the notion of total racial integration (Lewis, 1964, pp. 4-5).

Lewis (1964) identified those influences prior to 1954 which prepared the American people for a drastic change in race relations. He cited Southern industrialization and urbanization, which allowed for anonymity; the perfection of mass communication technologies such as the radio and television; the conscription of American youth into a desegregated armed forces, and steady political and legislative growth of

the American Negro (Lewis, 1964, p. 5). But nothing held as much power as the initial United States Supreme Court cases heard in 1954.

Those Early Supreme Court Cases: Change Begins

Centralization of American educational administration to the Federal level chiefly began with the Judicial branch of the government mandating educational behaviors and provisions. The notions of integration, segregation, and desegregation played prominent roles in the Federal Government's ascendency to educational power, and subsequently led to what scholars (Lewis, 1964; Brauer, 1977) have called the second American Revolution: the decade of the 1960s, and the evolution of the John F. Kennedy presidential administration. However, one can argue that governmental interest in the control of American school governance revealed itself much earlier.

One of the first Supreme Court cases dealing with the notion of civil rights, after the Dred Scott case, dealt with the constitutionality of a Louisiana law, passed in 1890, which mandated "equal but separate accommodations for the white and colored races" on all passenger railways within the state. The case is known as **Plessy v. Ferguson**. The court ruled in favor of separate but equal accommodations, not on the basis of any legal precedence, but on sociological factors. In

its decision, Justice Henry Billings Brown declared that in the interest of the "public peace and good order," it was preserving the state legislature enactment.

In the dissenting argument, Justice John Marshall Harlan stated that "the thin disguise of 'equal accommodations' will not mislead anyone, nor atone for the wrong this day done" (Lofgren, 1987, pp. 5-6).

Nearly sixty years later, the United States Supreme Court, under the leadership of Chief Justice Earl Warren was to reverse itself. In 1954, the Warren Court faced four cases involving Negro children who had been denied admission to public schools because of their race: Tokepa, Kansas, Clarendon County, South Carolina, Prince Edward County, Virginia, and New Castle County, Delaware. By sheer act of fate, the first case, Oliver Brown et al. v. Board of Education of Topeka (347 US 483, 98 L ed 873, 74 S Ct 686) was first on the docket, and hence became the most famous of the four similar cases.

Justice Warren acknowledged that "these cases come to us from the states of Kansas, South Carolina, Virginia, and Delaware. They are premised on different facts ... but a common legal question ... The plaintiffs contend that segregated public schools are not equal and cannot be made equal" (Warren, 1959, p. 117). In rendering the majority opinion, Justice Warren seemed to

be reaffirming the state and local governments decentralized control over American educational administration. He wrote that

> today, education is perhaps the most important function of state and local governments. Compulsory school attendance laws and the great expenditures for education both demonstrate our recognition of the importance of education to our democratic society (Warren, 1959, p. 120).

While the Court did not specifically state that the national government assumed responsibility for American school governance, it showed that intent by mandatory judicial reform. It concluded that separate educational facilities were inherently unequal (Warren, 1959, p. 122).

National Centralization Continues: 1960s Education Laws and Programs

Under the guidelines of the General Education Provisions Act the Education Division and the National Center for Education Statistics were created. Within the Education Division, the Office of Education and the National Institute of Education were created. The Office of Education became "the primary agency of the Federal Government responsible for the administration of programs of financial assistance to educational agencies, institutions, and organizations" (United

States. Congress. House, 1977, p. 3). The national government was centralizing control over the education of the nation's youth.

The Federal Government compiled between 1977 and 1984 three volumes of its educational legislative activity. Collectively these acts, revisions, and amendments number over 129 pieces of legislative activity, and the number of pages required to print these items occupy over 1,520 pages.

Perhaps the most well-known Congressional act is the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 with its amendments in 1966 and 1969. It initially provided financial assistance at the local level for the education of children of low-income families. It was created as an extension of Public Law 874, and allocated monies for school library resources, textbooks, other instructional materials, and counseling and testing. Additionally its aim was to strengthen state and local education agencies, provide for education of the handicapped and the development of bilingual education programs. Centralization of control over this funding was raised to the Federal level. "In administering the provisions of this Act and any Act amended by this act, the Commission shall consult with other Federal departments and agencies administering programs which may be effectively coordinated with programs carried

out... . (United States. Congress. House, 1977, p. 149).

Conant and the Comprehensive High School

Throughout the decades of the 1950s and 1960s, James B. Conant, Chairman of a Commission of the National Association of Secondary School Principals on a Study of the American Secondary School, conducted an analysis of the comprehensive high school in the United States. In defining the nature and function of the comprehensive high school, Conant mirrors centralist advocates' rationale for the adoption of a centralized form of American school governance and educational administration. Drawing from James Gardner, President of the Carnegie Corporation of New York, Conant wrote that

> The comprehensive high school is a peculiarly American phenomenon. It is called comprehensive because it offers, under one administration and under one roof (or series of roofs), secondary education for almost all the high school age children of one town or neighborhood. It is responsible for educating the boy who will be an atomic scientist and the girl who will marry at eighteen; ... . It is responsible, in sum, for providing good and appropriate education, both academic and vocational, for all young people within a democratic environment... (p. 3).

After defining the nature of the comprehensive high school, Conant continues by establishing three functions of such a school. He noted that the comprehensive high

school must (1) provide a "general" education for all students within a given locale, (2) make available to the general student population a variety of elective programs which provide skills the student might find beneficial after graduation, and (3) provide a strong college preparatory program for those students wishing to continue their education at a college or university (Conant, 1967, p. 23).

Conant (1967) reinforces and validates studies by scholars such as Eginton (1934), Butterworth (1948), Chase (1948), Gregg (1948), Kimball (1948), Humphreys (1952), Harris (1953), and his own earlier study (1957). All these studies point to perceived economic, social and academic benefits to be derived from the centralization of educational effort.

Big-City Schools: Decentralization in the Seventies

Tyack (1974) contended that throughout the nineteenth-century, centralization of big-city school districts was the dominant trend in American school governance and educational administration. If his contention is correct, then, during the 1970s a reversal of that trend occurred. As we have seen, throughout rural America during the era just after World War I through the end of the 1970s consolidation of schools and school districts was the trend. In larger cities, decentralization assumed dominance as the chief method

of American school governance and educational administration. A cross-section of larger metropolitan areas in the United States revealed this fact. The school districts in Los Angeles, Detroit, Chicago, and New York City, highlight this fact.

By 1970, in the city of Los Angeles, achievement scores were unacceptably low. Fifty percent of the student body in Los Angeles' schools were either from Mexican-American or Black families. Despite this approximate 50:50 ratio of minority students to white students, by 1970 little had been done toward integration. O'Shea (1975) explained that only after the unification of minority groups, who applied pressure to change the status quo, did change actually begin. Minority groups (Black and Mexican Americans) united to gain local control over their schools. When these groups united, the Los Angeles Board of Education began initiating structural reform.

For whatever reasons, the Board of Education acquiesced to minority demands for decentralization of control, and it redefined the community's political relationship with the school system. This re-definition allowed minority leaders to reduce their dependency on the central board with relation to the administration and control of their schools. O'Shea (1975) pointed out that from that time on "the board and central administration were made to feel conscious of the

dependance of the educational system on minority group support" (p. 381).

Another factor which contributed to the success of the decentralist demands of the unified minority leaders' to acquire local control, and hence a redefinition of their power relationship with the Board of Education, was a change in the makeup of that board. A liberal dominance of the Board was a significant contributing factor to the success of the decentralizing reform effort. The political alignments of the Board, a former stumbling block to reform, changed.

Among the educational reforms argued and implemented as a result of decentralization efforts were (1) fragmentation of the larger district into decentralized eight elementary and four high school administrative "zones," (2) decentralization of administrative areas into twelve K-12 areas by 1971, and (3) mandatory creation of a system of elected school community-advisory councils (O'Shea, 1975, p. 383).

By adopting a decentralized administrative structure and creating school level community advisory councils, the district began specializing its operational units to deal differentially with environmental pressures, and thereby making the councils more responsive to local needs. The thrust, then, of the decentralization arguments which eventually assumed dominance of school administration were (1) the

necessity for improving test scores, (2) the end to segregated schools, (3) the need for a board more responsive to the needs of the communities involved, and (4) elimination of the perceived apathy on the part of the County Board of Education.

In Detroit, Michigan, similar conditions existed. At the heart of these cries for decentralization of the educational system's administration was the issue of "community control." Pilo (1975) claimed that "the movement for administrative decentralization in Detroit ... dates at least as far back as 1956 when the elementary schools were divided into districts" (p. 404). However, this early movement actually represented deconcentration rather than decentralization, for, it was not until 1967 that the public began demanding community control. This demand stemmed from a seemingly innocuous event--the appointment of Norman Drachler as Superintendent of Schools. With Drachler's appointment came his strong push for integration.

Additionally, Drachler increased the representation of Blacks among the city's teaching faculty. Pilo (1975) in his examination of Detroit's decentralization initiative stated that the representation of Black instructors rose from 31.7% to 41.2%. Black, non-instructional support staff rose from 41.6% to 58.2%. In addition to increasing the numbers of blacks at these

"lower" levels, Drachler appointed two Black deputy superintendents.

As the makeup of the Board changed, "in 1968, ... [it] ... seized the initiative ... [recommending] a form of administrative decentralization" (Pilo, 1975, p. 406). The board did not decentralize power, however, but merely allowed principals more authority in running their individual schools. As a result of the Board's failure to transfer legitimate power, interference with educational reform developed. The Board came to realize that some power had to be decentralized. However, there existed widespread disagreement over the kinds and amounts of power which needed to be decentralized. Numbers of studies were commissioned to address the transfer of power issue. Meanwhile, unrest continued.

Pilo (1975) recounted that the Black community rallied for community control. After legislative battles and repeated negotiations, the reorganization of Detroit's public school system into eight regions became effective January 1, 1971, and a hint of political decentralization began to emerge.

Once again a change in board constitution acted as the agent of change. This time the educational reform occurred in Chicago, Illinois. Cibulka (1975) cited three decentralization efforts by Chicago's city schools (1) administrative re-organization, giving field administrators more authority, (2) greater citizen

participation at the community level, and (3) reform of governance structures allowing for greater policy-making and administrative authority by local communities and minority groups. As with Los Angeles and Detroit, the administrative unit changed.

In 1967, after James Redmond became superintendent, he announced a reorganization plan aimed at decentralizing some of the administrative decision-making processes. District superintendents were given more authority with the chief reason given for this decentralist shift being the need to facilitate greater responsiveness to the needs of their local communities. However, Cibulka (1975) also stated that Redmond had a hidden agenda--the break-up of the powerful "kitchen cabinet" of the former superintendent. Redmond's plan called for a reorganization of the central office staff which placed responsibility for their supervision under deputy superintendents and created three new area associate superintendents.

Citizen Advisory Councils seemed to be the best solution to attain greater citizen participation at the local community level. The purpose of these councils was to advise administrators on decisions. Under Redmond, Chicago's decentralizing reform efforts were somewhat disappointing. Most initiatives have met with opposition and only marginal success.

However, a newer movement is gaining support in Chicago. "The primary issue in Chicago is the quality of education provided a student body largely [consisting] of minority groups" (Pipho, 1988, p. 398). The public is becoming increasingly concerned over the continued decline in educational quality. Chicagoans have, therefore, devised a plan of their own. The public united under a common banner, CURE (Chicagoans United to Reform Education). CURE devised a plan to "cure" Chicago of its poor quality education. The chief elements of the CURE plan, as defined by Pipho (1988), were

> (1) transforming each school into an effective school in which students master basic skills, (2) making schools accountable to their neighborhoods by placing most decisions in the hands of elected school governing councils composed of parents, community representatives and teachers (3) giving a central board key powers in limited areas, (4) dramatically cutting the size of the school system bureaucracy, (5) increasing choice for students and parents, (6) linking local schools with businesses, universities, and other resource groups that can help them improve, and (7) planning carefully for an orderly transition to the new school system (p. 398-399).

One element of the CURE plan which seems to be having a measurable effect is that element which makes schools accountable to their neighborhoods. Education Week, March 14, 1990, reported that the Chicago councils were actively involved in the decision-making process. "In their first major exercise of extraordinary powers

granted them under the 1988 reform law, 49 of Chicago's newly elected school councils voted ... not to retain their current principals" (p. 1).

As was the case in Los Angeles, Detroit, and Chicago, New York City's residents demanded local control over their schools. Rogers (1982) stated that in 1970, after nearly ten years of unrest and turbulence over the poor quality of the educational system in New York City, and after the passage of the 1969 Decentralization Law, the City began a "critical social experiment"--a test at the delegation of community control. In delegating this control, decentralizing, the City addressed (1) the quality of education, (2) the equality of the delivery of educational services among racial and ethnic groups, and (3) the system's accountability to that public served. Pipho (1988) argued that at this point in time the word "crisis" was most often used in describing the state of education and its administration in New York City.

As Rogers (1982) pointed out, by the mid-1960s, community control became the slogan and rallying cry of New York City educational reform advocates (p. 13). The primary goal of the 1970 decentralization movement was the decentralization of the New York City elementary and junior high school systems into smaller community school districts. Each of these reformed districts had elected community school boards. These boards held control over

budget, staffing and educational programs. Additionally educators were accountable to these boards for the quality of the educational services they rendered.

"A basic goal of community control advocates was ethnic succession, and it was that goal more than all the others that activated strong resistance from a predominantly white education group within the system" (Rogers, 1982, p. 14). The concept of decentralization leading to community control then, met with formidable opposition--New York City's educators and their unions. Collectively these argued that decentralization of the educational administration would (1) make the system inefficient as many services would be duplicated, (2) cause many good programs to be lost, and (3) cause the deterioration of New York City schools.

Proponents for decentralization countered with arguments that (1) New York City schools were already in a state of crisis, (2) the schools' deterioration was already an accomplished fact, (3) minorities were being discriminated against, and (4) the system was not responsive to the needs of the community. Proponents of community control ultimately triumphed and the decentralization of New York City's schools was effected. Rogers (1982) pointed out that the end result of this decentralization has been that the New York City school system became more responsive than was its centralized predecessor.

Decentralization and the Rural Community

While late into the decade of the seventies centralization of school districts was the rule rather than the exception, those exceptions oftentimes proved to be volatile, captured national attention and were filled with emotional arguments. Schools in rural settings served the economic, academic and social needs of children as well as the nation's needs for economic and political development. And caught between these needs for economic, academic, social and political development was the need for the community to survive (Peshkin, 1982, p. 4).

As late as the mid-1970s, as the national government was engaged in the process of decentralizing much of its control over American school governance (the birth of the New Federalism), economic and technological forces continued to exercise control over the consolidation process. Peshkin (1982) noted that the decline in the numbers of family farms coupled with an increase in urbanization undermined the need for large numbers of small schools. It was assumed by most educators that consolidation of small school districts into larger ones was essential for the fiscal soundness of school districts.

Peshkin (1982) also identified six traditional arguments against school district consolidation. These

arguments centered around Peshkin's notion of the symbolic functions of schools and included (1) Community control--a school stands as a symbol of community autonomy because it remains as the only remnant in a state of the concept of local control; (2) Community vitality--continued maintenance of a school by a community remains a measure of that community's well-being; (3) Community integration--oftentimes the local school is the area's centrally located institution and serves to socialize or integrate the community; (4) Personal control--the school's proximity engenders a feeling of personal control thereby creating an aura of security and safety; (5) Personal and community tradition--local schools become embedded in local tradition. The memories generated by the children as they walk to and from school or the use of school facilities after school hours and on week-ends play as vital a role as the school's educational function. In other words, the school assumes its place in the tradition of the community and (6) Personal and community identity--schools help in determining individuality and a sense of community and assume prominence as personal and community identities evolve.

Conclusions: It Depends on Where You Live

During the period between 1940 and 1980, American school governance experienced strong centralizing

tendencies. There also existed a strong tendency to decentralize as well. Where once decentralization seemed the answer for rural America, centralization dominated. Where once centralization seemed the answer in urban America, decentralization dominated.

Across the rural United States, centralization advocates (Punke, 1945; Butterworth, 1948; Chase, 1948; Gregg, 1948, Kimball, 1948; Humphreys, 1952; Harris, 1953; Jacobson, 1968; Mullins 1973) argued that consolidation of school districts allowed for richer program development, better and more effective leadership, a more modern educational facility with increased services for the youth could be provided, and an equalization of the tax burden for education. Additionally supporters of consolidation efforts pointed to the increased efficiency of the administrative unit with eventual reductions in the numbers of administrative staff.

The American Association of School Administrators (1958) highlighted arguments against consolidation. The Association reported that proponents of local control argued its importance, the elimination of the school plant from the neighborhoods, an increase in school taxes, a lessening of parental influence, transportation dangers and an overall weakening of the community.

Throughout urban America, the argument shifted to local control. Playing a prominent role in the

evolution of a decentralized American school governance and educational administration were minority rights' issues. From a sample drawn from four big-city administrative operations, a decentralist argument evolved. At the heart of the concerns of the people in each of the communities of Los Angeles, Detroit, Chicago, and New York City was the issue of providing effective educational opportunity for minority Americans, chiefly Black Americans and Mexican Americans. Primary decentralization arguments identified by decentralization advocates (O'Shea, 1975; Pilo, 1975; Cibulka, 1975; Rogers, 1982) were that centralization of administration led to a deterioration of educational programs and facilities, those who governed education were not responsive to the needs of the local communities; and minority groups were not being provided a good education. Reorganization of American school governance and educational administration would lead to greater citizen participation at the community level and reform of the governance structures by the local communities.

As the period came to a close, decentralist advocates gained strength, and the national government, recognizing the significant financial burden of governing American school governance and educational administration, began to relinquish control to the state

level. The country entered into a period of New Federalism spearheaded by the Richard Nixon, Ronald Reagan and George Bush presidential administrations.

CHAPTER 7

The New Federalism: A Trend Toward Decentralization

> Government is not the solution to our problem. Government is the problem. (Ronald Reagan, First Inaugural Address)

Those who advocate reform use as the tools for their reform efforts concepts of centralization and decentralization. When the federal government sought to bring about reform at the national level centralist philosophies gave way to decentralist ones, as might be predicted. This notion has come to be known as New Federalism. Reagan and Sanzone (1981) define "New Federalism" as a political and pragmatic concept which stresses the interdependence and sharing functions between the national government and state governments focusing on the leverage that each is able to exert on the other (p. 3). This conceptualization of a new federalism did not develop in a microcosm. It evolved over time and through presidential administrations dating back to the Kennedy and Johnson eras which sought the centralization of powers over programs, facilities and services. In fact, in the twenty years between 1960 and 1980, the United States Congress became progressively more involved in American school governance and educational administration. Ornstein

(1984) pointed out that between the years 1960 and 1980 the Congress passed more than fifty-three acts and/or amendments to those acts which directly affected education. He highlights the significance of this figure by stating that these fifty-three acts and/or amendments are over twice as many as the twenty-five acts passed by the Congress from 1787 to 1959. He included the passage of the Northwest Ordinance of 1787 in this figure (p. 6).

"Creative Federalism:" The 1960s Evolution

Reagan (in Gelfand and Neymeyer, 1985) analyzed the federalist attitude of the 1960s and addressed the centralizing federalism of both the Kennedy and Johnson administrations. He noted that, without mentioning the idea of centralization, President John F. Kennedy, in his first State of the Union address in 1961, "urged federal aid to education, substantial aid to the cities, and the creation of the Department of Housing and Urban affairs ... clearly ... a president who looked toward an enlarged rather than a diminished national government" (p. 33). In subsequent messages in 1962 and 1963, Kennedy again argued for a centralist federal governmental control, while never mentioning the concept of centralization. In both those State of the Union messages, Kennedy continued to call for new federal grant programs, some operating in conjunction with state

agencies, and some by-passing the state to the local level. (Reagan, 1985, p. 33).

As a prelude to the evolution of the notion of "New Federalism," the concept of "creative federalism" evolved during the Lyndon B. Johnson presidency. The "creative federalism" of the Johnson administration transcended the notion of cooperative federalist attitudes and emphasized direct relationships between the national government and local (city) governments.

Reagan (1985) noted that after the assassination of John F. Kennedy and Lyndon B. Johnson's assumption of the presidency, centralization of governmental intervention increased. Johnson spoke of a cooperative federalism which nationally addressed the issue of poverty and argued for improved national organization and support aimed at poverty's elimination, a "Great Society." Johnson proposed far-reaching actions under the label of the "Great Society" which included federal control over education, urban development, the environment, racial discrimination, regional economic development, voter's rights, and health care, among others (pp. 33-34).

Reagan and Sanzone (1981) explained that the creative federalism of the Johnson administration bypassed

> the states, and--even more significantly--contracted relationships between federal agencies and non-governmental organizations. Community action groups under the war on poverty, containing representatives of the beneficiary groups, illustrate one branch of contractual creative federalism, while the use of private corporations such as Litton Industries ... exemplifies the so-called private federalism.... (p. 25).

Presidential reform after the "Creative Federalism" of the Lyndon Johnson administration began to deviate from a centralist to a decentralist philosophy. The Johnson administration, however, represented the peak of the spiraling monetary fiscal crisis in the United States which began at the turn of the twentieth century. Reagan and Sanzone (1981) observed that the shift from decentralization to centralization brought about this crisis. They studied the financial impact of centralization of control to the national level, and in doing so, they discovered substantial revenue increases. For example, they noted the rise in state and local general revenues from $15.6 billion in 1948 to $200.6 billion by 1976 while state-local debt rose from $24 billion to $277 billion for the same period (pp. 35-36).

Additionally state debts escalated at phenomenal rates, rising from $68 billion in 1964 to $180 billion by 1978 (a 300 percent increase). Simultaneously the federal government kicked in funds to help the financially ailing states (p. 36).

Federal funds in terms of grants-in-aid rose from $7 billion in 1960 to $98.1 billion by 1982, accounting for approximately thirty-three percent of state-local governmental revenues by 1978. By 1979, state-local expenditures had risen from the 1960 figure of $61 billion to a staggering $335 billion. Simultaneously, federal expenditures rose from $90 billion to an incredible $429 billion. And all these monies had to be derived from three specific taxes: income (59% of the federal government's revenues), consumption (52% of state governments' revenues), and property (81% of local governments' revenues). By 1976, just as the Nixon administration began instituting its new federalist decentralizing reforms, the income tax represented 57 percent of all public tax revenues, consumption taxes 21 percent and property taxes 16 percent. Since the national government collected the biggest share of the largest revenue producer, its dominance accounted for 56.5 percent of all public revenues by 1976, with the states collecting 24.5 percent and local governments taking in the least at 19 percent (Reagan and Sanzone, 1981, pp. 37-38). Additionally, Reagan and Sanzone (1981) argued that

> These data add up to something else, too: That there [had] been a drastic centralization in American fiscal federalism, for in 1902 the federal share was not 56.5 but 38 percent; the state share, not 24.5 but 11 percent; and the local share was not 19 but 51 percent! As

> measured by revenues, the role of the states [did not atrophy] but there [was] a very considerable question of relative financial atrophy at the local level (p. 38).

The political appeal, therefore, of local governments' reliance upon the federal government is understandable. The national government relied upon the most elastic (responsiveness of a tax to changes in the economy) of all current taxes, the income tax. State and local governments saw the national source as a way to solve their fiscal crises (Reagan and Sanzone, 1981, pp. 38-39).

In addition to the elasticity of the income tax, another chief reason for the state and local governments' reliance was relative regressivity (a tax whose burden is born primarily by lower income rather than higher income tax-payers) of state and local sales taxation methods.

As previously observed, the property tax is that tax most heavily relied upon by local governments (an exception having always been the state of Louisiana which relies more on sales taxes). That tax came under close scrutiny during the decades of the 1960s and 1970s. Tax-payers revolted against that tax, and throughout the United States, people sought to have that tax lowered. Property tax reduction advocates successfully argued that ownership of property was not an adequate measure of the property owner's ability to

pay taxes. While the property tax has been over-worked and over-used, it remained the chief revenue-gathering method for support of public education.

Conlan (1988) addressed the idea of presidential reform in analyzing reform efforts of the Nixon and Reagan administrations. He noted that the "presidential prescriptions for federalist reform have varied greatly--from the centralizing Creative Federalism of Lyndon Johnson at one extreme, to the anti-national New Federalism of Ronald Reagan at the other" (p. 2). Republican presidential reform efforts were aimed at a reduction of the welfare state. Conlan (1988) asserts that new federalist reform efforts can be traced from the Eisenhower administration. He points out that the Republican presidential administrations of Eisenhower, Nixon, and Reagan attempted comprehensive reform. Conlan (1988) categorized these presidents' reform efforts as:

> --re-allocation (sorting out): certain functions along with the resources to finance them would be decentralized to state and local governments (Eisenhower):
>
> --consolidation (blocking): resources would remain centralized, but would be used to finance decentralized functions (Nixon); and
>
> --devolution (turnbacks): functions would be discontinued and in that sense decentralized, but would not get federal financial assistance (Reagan) (pp. xiv-xv).

By 1969 Nixon expressed concern that the problems of the cities not only had reached crisis proportions, but also that the federal government had failed to deliver what it promised in such a way that it had hampered the effectiveness of local governments through its construction of a complex federal grant-in-aid system. For example, the Advisory Committee on Intergovernmental Relations reported that at one point in the late 1960s the Office of Education managed eight separate programs under six different laws which authorized grants to libraries. (Gelfand and Neymeyer, 1985, pp. 35-39).

A Decade of Chaos and Contradiction: 1970s

As a consequence of controls such as these, Nixon announced that he intended to remedy the situation by decentralizing power to state and local governments. While never mentioning the term "decentralization of power," Nixon stated that he intended to "strengthen state and local governments [so much so] that by the end of the coming decade [1970s], the political landscape [would] be visibly altered, and states and cities [would] have a far greater share of power and responsibility... (Nixon in Gelfand and Neymeyer, 1985, p. 36).

The New Federalism of the Nixon administration laid the foundation for the New Federalism of the Reagan administration. In understanding the impact of this New Federalism on American educational administration, it is important to review the basic tenets of both the Nixon and Reagan New Federalist programs.

Richard Nixon's New Federalism encompassed four primary objectives. The first objective aimed at improving program coordination, efficiency and planning. The second aimed at consolidation of federal aid programs. Nixon enacted this consolidation effort by establishing a series of block grants which were expected to simplify program operation and facilitate a reduction in bureaucratic influence and increased local and state participation. This centralization of block grant programs allowed for a decentralization of the bureaucracy.

The third aspect of the Nixon New Federalism involved Nixon's "new American revolution," the expansion of the block grant principle through revenue sharing to state and local governments. On October 20, 1972, Nixon signed into law the "State and Local Fiscal Assistance Act" which came to be popularly known as General Revenue Sharing (GRS). This act was based on the transference of federal revenue to sub-national governments with as few federal guidelines as possible. Finally, the fourth aspect of the Nixon New Federalism

involved an effort to "nationalize public sector responsibilities in those areas in which the federal government was deemed to be more efficient or effective ... direct entitlements and ... areas of social regulation" (Conlan, 1988, p. 3).

Smith (1985) postulates that "federalism may constitute a further development of regionalism when it is thought necessary to limit the power of the central government" (p. 155). He additionally points to Preston King's (1982) notion of "decentralist federalism" which is a representation of a move from a unitary state to one in which constituent territories are given constitutional safeguards.

In the early 1970s, the federal government began to shift the center of control for such social services as education back to the individual states, when, as Rabe (1988) suggests, President Richard M. Nixon hoped to transfer control from the Washington bureaucracy to local governments through New Federalism initiatives (p. 6). This trend continued through the Reagan and thus far Bush administrations of the 1980s and thus far into the 1990s.

The Reagan administration used as its base the programs already developed by the Nixon administration as the foundation for further expansion of the New Federalism; however, the Reagan strategy varied from Nixon's. "For example, the primary purpose of

management reforms in the Reagan administration [was] to reduce power, influence, and morale of the national bureaucracy ... . Block grants [were] a stepping stone to the ultimate elimination of federal involvement in the affected program areas" (Conlan, 1988, p. 3). Reagan used these block grants to switch from categorical funding for education. "What the block grants do is replace dozens of highly regulated programs with a handful of 'fed strings' programs; they provide money to the states to fund programs they feel are important" (Ornstein, 1984, p. 5-6).

Winn (1990) closely aligns the Reagan "New Federalism" with the "Limited Federalism" espoused by John C. Calhoun in the early nineteenth century. Calhoun favored union but not centralism. He felt that control belonged to the individual states. In a similar vein, for Ronald Reagan, "New Federalism" meant a stripping away and limiting of the power of the Washington bureaucracy, an end to much centralism. He planned to accomplish this goal through consolidation and deregulation.

With the Reagan administration, "many true believers thought that the push to shift power to the states was a sign that their day had finally arrived. Big government was on the way out and states' rights were coming in" (Bernstein, 1988, p. 110). The shifting of resources and control through the revenue

sharing ideology of the Nixon Administration's "New Federalism" differed significantly from the Reagan "New Federalism." While Nixon's "New Federalism" transferred not only responsibility but resources as well, Reagan's "New Federalism" sought to transfer only responsibility and authority without transferring the necessary resources (Green, 1985).

Clark and Amiot (1981) and Clark, Astuto and Rooney (1983) studied Reagan's "New Federalism" in terms of policy shifts. These researchers identified five shifts: (1) a reduction in federal expenditures in education; (2) reduction in enforcement of rules and regulations; (3) removal of control over education from federal level to state and local levels; (4) limiting the authority of the Department of Education; and (5) a narrowing of the federal role in educational governance. In other words, they identified the Reagan policy shift as diminution, deregulation, decentralization, disestablishment and de-emphasis.

Political analysts theorized that if the Federal Government shifted responsibility back to the states, a laissez-faire attitude would be adopted by the states and nothing much would be done. But what actually happened was that this "New Federalism" (by now just over a decade old) spurred the states into action on everything from the minimum wage to parental leave" (Bernstein, 1988, p. 10).

Reagan's New Federalism sought to distance the federal government as far as possible from the voters and have decisions concerning such necessities as education made at the state level. Bernstein (1988) suggests that the federal government thought that the states would not be willing to assume these responsibilities. Reagan seemed to believe that by shifting power and authority to the states, decisions would remain unmade. The federal government appeared to want decisions to remain unmade because it assumed that unmade decisions would be a painless way to maintain the status quo (Bernstein, 1988). In actuality, that assumption was in error.

What manner did these shifts in power under the Reagan administration take? Rabe (1988) points out that categorical programs funded by the federal government steadily declined. Their numbers dwindled from the 1980 peak of 539 to a 1987 low of 435. Some of these programs were eliminated completely, and some were combined with others into block grants. Grants-in-aid fell from 3.4% of the gross national product in 1980 to 2.0% by 1988.

There are those who argued for a new federal-state relationship with regard to educational administration. Harder (1983) identified those principles which he felt should characterize the evolving federal-state relationship involving American school governance.

Those principles which should characterize federal involvement in education are:

> (1) the federal role should be limited when needs are already being addressed by the states; (2) federal programs should be compatible with priorities set by the states in carrying out their responsibilities to provide for public education; (3) federal involvement is justified when an educational program is in response to an overriding national interest; (4) federal aid to education should be general so that states can set up their own priorities and not be bound to an agenda set at the national level; (5) provision should be made for the coordination of federal programs within each state; and (6) federal programs within states should not be fragmented, and requirements should not be duplicative (Ornstein, 1984, p. 6; Harder, 1983, pp. 81-93).

With this New Federalism, states have taken the initiative and begun some attempts at much needed educational reform. Bernstein (1988) states that instead of "burying their heads in the sand" as the Republican Administration hoped, states began to overhaul, among other things, public education. In effect, this New Federalism has had the effect of "affirming the role of the government, not denying or reducing it ... Dozens of states and school districts have initiated reform" (p. 110). Most of this reform has come in calls for decentralization of control, not to the state level, but to the local level. By the end of the first decade of the New Federalism, "dozens of states and school districts have initiated reforms such as giving teachers more involvement in setting school

curricula" with many of the states releasing control past the county level to the local community (Bernstein, 1988, p. 110).

Federal education policies seem to be evolving in three areas: a shift in priorities, a reduction in federal funding, and a reduction in federal programs for big city schools. The shift in priorities is taking the federal government out of its role as the human and social or educational provider to that of the entrepreneur or businessman. By reducing federal funding to education, the federal government is shifting responsibility for the provision of these services back to the state. The reduction in programs in big city schools allows the federal government to shift from its egalitarian role and increase federal support for programs where it perceives a felt need--mathematics and the sciences (Ornstein, 1984, p. 7).

A Call for Educational Reform: Decentralization

"Like Black & Decker Dustbusters, the new reforms--school based management, shared decision making, teacher empowerment, restructured schools--have swept the nation" (Murphy, 1989, p. 808). With the initiation of this New Federalism, power was diverted from the Federal level and mandated to the state level. States, in turn, shifted some, but not all, power to the local level. What began was a search for the proper mix

of authority between state and local levels--particularly where education has been concerned. Phipho (1988) postulated that the manner in which each state adopted a decentralist attitude and mixed controls, incentives and rewards, would remain unique to individual states and large city school districts.

Throughout the decades of the 1970s and 1980s, Allan C. Ornstein studied the centralization and decentralization trends of larger public school districts throughout the United States (Ornstein 1974, 1975, 1984, 1989). He cites as primary impetus for American educational administration's current decentralist trend the "increasing pressure from minority groups, accompanied by increasing pressure for reform from educators" (Ornstein, 1981, p. 24).

Ornstein (1981) argues that what appears to be merging are three alternative patterns of decentralization: (1) administrative decentralization--a type of deconcentration which divides school systems into smaller units while centrally retaining power to the board of education or other similar governing body, (2) community participation--a type of decentralization of policy suggestion input, still no power is transferred from the central governing body, and (3) community control--the extreme of decentralization where elected community school board members share decision-making authority with the central board (pp. 24-25).

Recognizing the notion that patterns of centralization and decentralization operate on a continuum, Ornstein (1981) suggests that while these three emerging alternatives have their own distinct characteristics, none excludes characteristics of the other. While these three models seem distinct, they actually "telescope" into two models: administrative decentralization with community participation and administrative decentralization with community control.

In addressing the issue of community control during the decade of the 1970s, Ornstein, Levine and Wilkerson (1975) observed that before the mid-nineteen sixties there appeared to be little interest in school district decentralization or in the notion of community control. After World War II and the Korean War, American school governance and educational administration experienced extreme centralization. School district mergers continued their drastic decline as districts adopted consolidation measures. However, as the educational community remained consolidating its districts, the national government, under the leadership of President Richard M. Nixon, began its New Federalism program of decentralization.

By the early nineteen seventies, just as President Richard Nixon was developing his New Federalist manner of national governance, decentralization of American school governance and educational administration to the

level of community control also assumed a national prominence. Scholars (Fantini, 1970; Levine, 1970; Lyke, 1970, Ornstein, 1974; Ornstein, Levine, Wilkerson and Doxey, 1975; and Ornstein, 1981) pointed to the rationale used by both proponents and opponents of community control of American school governance and educational administration.

Collectively, proponents of community control reasoned that community control would (1) make teachers and administrators more accountable to the people; (2) lead to educational innovation; (3) lead to greater parental and public participation; (4) enable local school boards to hire qualified principals and superintendents; (5) enhance flexible hiring and promotion practices and attract teachers and administrators with more initiative and innovative capacity; (6) raise student achievement scores; (7) promote self-government for blacks, as well as for other minorities; and (8) lead to educational reform (Ornstein, Levine and Wilkerson, 1975, pp. 117-119).

Ornstein, Levine and Wilkerson (1975) also identified the opposing rationale to each of the eight arguments in support of community control over American school governance and educational administration. These authors noted sixteen attacks to the rationale of

community control advocates. They suggested that opponents of community control argued that should community control take hold, it would (1) lead to vigilante groups (2) promote those who could not competently assess the performance of teachers and administrators, (3) empower those whose conclusions are already biased; (4) be politically governed by individual group's self-interest and ideologies.

Ornstein, Levine and Wilkerson (1975) further reported that opponents of community control countered that (5) community control inhibits educational innovation because innovation is based upon pilot testing and community control inhibits adequate pilot testing; (6) the majority of people are not interested in educational issues and do not generally participate in school meetings; (7) community control would lead to ethnic and racial favoritism; (8) patronage, nepotism and pork-barrel practices would result; (9) a community governing board would not be sufficiently prepared to recognize initiative and innovation; (10) student achievement scores would not necessarily rise, as there has been no documentation lending support to the claim of community control advocates that achievement scores would rise as well; (11) there is no empirical evidence that black teachers and administrators can raise the achievement levels of black students; (12) community control represents a

return to the "separate but equal" doctrine and (13) it will foster white ethnicity and backlash; (14) community control will allow for white domination of the suburbs and black domination of the ghetto areas; (15) it inhibits school desegregation and (16) it operates from a position of weakness. American school governance and educational administration needs the rich resources of larger units from state or national levels (pp. 117-119).

In addition to countering arguments by community control advocates, critics of community participation reasoned that community participation would only result in impediments to societal progress and change. Ornstein, Levine and Wilkerson (1975) pointed out that opponents to the idea of community participation and control reasoned that community control would (1) impede integration; (2) balkanize the cities; (3) serve as a scheme to alleviate pressures from the black community for integration and better education by members of the black community; (4) lead to district control by those inexperienced in confronting complex educational issues; (5) destroy the merit system; (6) weaken the teachers' unions; (7) distract from the greater need for money to educate children, specifically children in the ghetto areas; (8) enhance black racism; and (9) lead to rejection of white participation (pp. 116-117).

Ornstein, Levine and Wilkerson (1975) also identified the opposing rationale to each of the nine arguments in opposition to the decentralist rationale of community control over American school governance and educational administration and noted fourteen points of a centralist rationale. Providing decentralist community control, centralization proponents argued, (1) impeded integration because integration implies white assimilation (2) showed signs of enabling a more segregated school system since Brown vs. the Board of Education and (3) did not provide for the will of the majority of citizens, black and white alike.

Continuing their argument, proponents of the centralization of American school governance and educational administration argued that (4) in most cities, the opposition was already balkanized; (5) all community members, black and white alike, were concerned with the quality of education for their children and suggested that black community pressure was a thing of the past; (6) merit system progression was already controlled by white-oriented examinations, (7) passing those examinations did not necessarily prove one to be qualified for the job and (8) local school boards already selected from eligible lists of the most qualified regardless of the merit system in place; (9) teachers' unions were already weakened by splinter groups and (10) depletion of school budgets and other

fiscal problems such as the tax payers' revolts were underway during the 1970s; (11) community control was still being implemented while asking for additional education dollars; (12) the argument that black racism would increase was countered with the idea that blacks had experienced 400 years of white racism, (13) black children needed an education which would provide them with the necessary skills to cope with white discrimination; and (14) white administrators who exhibited responsiveness to the needs of the black community would be encouraged to remain at their posts (pp. 116-117).

Decentralization: 1980s Supportive Rationale

At the turn of the decade of the 1980s, analysts examined the status of decentralization movements concerning American school governance and educational administration throughout the United States. Ornstein (1981) observed that in a nationwide decentralization survey of school systems with a student population of 50,000 or more pupils, decentralization of organizational structure was the trend. Additionally he identified eight reasons why decentralization advocates were successful in achieving decentralization as the prescribed method of educational reform. Ornstein

(1981) wrote that there were numerous reasons why decentralization was considered desirable, but the top eight reasons were:

> (1) to enhance school-community relations; (2) to provide greater community input at the local level; (3) to provide local schools with more field and resource personnel; (4) to provide efficient maintenance and support for local schools; (5) to reduce the administrative span of control; (6) to provide greater linkages between local schools and the central board; (7) to redirect spending for local school needs; and (8) to provide greater curriculum continuity from kindergarten to grade twelve (p. 25).

While the federal government has recognized for over 200 years that governance, control and operation of public education were state functions, federal involvement in American school governance, with numerous strings attached, steadily grew in six areas: (1) the disadvantaged, minorities, women and the handicapped saw significant increases in federally regulated funds; (2) federal funding for programs aimed at achieving specified purposes steadily increased; (3) federal regulations in the 1960s and 1970s mandated that acceptance of federal dollars for one program meant that all other programs at that school were subject to governmental regulation; (4) federal regulations imposed massive compliance procedures in enforcing the 1960s and 1970s laws. These requirements often were imposed at a disproportionate rate as compared with the amount of

federal dollars offered; (5) federal funds for education became increasingly earmarked for specific programs such as special education with a "strings" policy replacing the "no-strings" policy of the past; and (6) Congress dominated federal education policymaking (Ornstein, 1984).

Ornstein (1981) reported that the 1980 findings closely paralleled those of a 1974 study. He did report, nevertheless, that he found little evidence to join the stated goals and the reality of current community decentralization plans (p. 25). However, in a follow-up study which he conducted in 1988, Ornstein (1989) contrasted his 1980 findings with his 1988 findings. He stated that "in 1980 ... 39 of 65 (60%) had decentralized and 8 were considering it....In 1988 only 31% considered themselves decentralized. We should conclude, then, that decentralization is waning" (p. 235). But Ornstein was in for somewhat of a surprise. The ultimate in decentralist philosophy was about to take hold in two states--Kentucky and Illinois.

Reform: Kentucky and Illinois Take the Lead

While Allan Ornstein, in late 1988, was suggesting that decentralization of American school governance and educational administration was waning, the states of Kentucky and Illinois were initiating educational reform designed to bring control of school governance to the

people. Kentucky passed its Education Reform Act in 1990 and Illinois implemented the School Reform Act in 1989. Collectively these two pieces of legislation point to a highly decentralist philosophy governing American school governance and educational administration.

Kentucky's Education Reform Act of 1990 was the most radical education reform act in decades. It affected every part of the Kentucky school governance structure. In effect the act completely abolished the Department of Education and mandated a reconstituted department. It required that the department be completely reconstituted with its function changing from that of chiefly governance in structure to a new department which was designed to provide technical assistance.

Additionally, the act had five other mandates. (1) Site-based management was to move to every school in Kentucky by 1995. Also, by the end of the fiscal year 1991-1992, one school in every district had to have implemented site-based management. (2) In the sixth year, 1996, every school in the state must have in place a site-based council. This council is to consist of two parents, three teachers and the principal. (3) Persons cannot be elected to the school board if they have relatives working within the school system. The Kentucky legislature directed this provision in an

attempt to eliminate mismanagement and create a system free of political influence. (4) Participation in political campaigning by teachers within the system is prohibited, neither are teachers allowed to contribute to political campaigns. However, this mandate allows for teachers to be the majority voice on the site-based management councils within the schools. (5) A new state superintendent of education had to be appointed and take office by January, 1991 (Harrington-Lueker, 1990, pp. 17-18).

In effect, the Education Reform Act of 1990 repositioned American school governance and educational administration in the state of Kentucky. What once was the province of the state superintendent has become the province of the local school. Kentucky has reverted to the seventeenth century "town meeting" philosophy and manner of school governance. Once again, the provision of public schooling is viewed as the chief responsibility and within the purview of parents and teachers. As in the late seventeenth century, most school governance occurs at the school building level.

This is not to imply that the state superintendent and the school board have been completely divested of power and authority. The school board continues to select the superintendent and defines the limits in which that superintendent functions. Additionally school boards retain the policy-making authority and the

authority to levy taxes. Boards remain responsible for programs, planning, budgeting, setting the curriculum, making oral contracts, transportation and setting the tax rate (Harrington-Lueker, 1990, p. 18).

Chicago's school system was deemed the worst in the nation by United States Secretary of Education William J. Bennett when he visited the city in 1987. The dropout rate in some schools was above 60 percent, and eighth grade students were reading at one-and-a-half grade levels below the national norm. The bureaucracy was notorious for its ineffectiveness and inefficiency. Parents of Chicago's school children were frequently subjected to rude and abusive bureaucrats. As Chicagoans had united in the 1970s and early 1980s in forming coalitions, parents once again came together to form a unified group to seek change. The result of their efforts was legislative reform.

Chicago's School Reform Act was passed by the Illinois legislature in November 1988 and first implemented in the summer of 1989. In effect, the Act completely repositioned the Chicago school governance structure. As in Kentucky, governance was not simply transferred from one board to another smaller board. Governance was transferred to the school site. Once again, site-based management is becoming the rule rather than the exception.

Where each site-based council in Kentucky comprised six members, Chicago's site-based governance council is composed of eleven. Six parents sit on Chicago's site-based governing board. These parents are elected by the children of the school. In addition to the six parents who sit on the board, the five remaining members include two community representatives who are elected by area residents, two teachers who are elected by the faculty at large, and the school principal. Each site-based council has been charged with developing a comprehensive plan aimed at school improvement (Rist, 1990, pp. 21-24).

The specific charges of these councils also include selection and retention of the school principal, drawing up the school budget, textbook selection, and the use to be made of discretionary monies. The School Reform Act empowered parents even more so than the Kentucky Education Reform Act of 1990. Whereas the Kentucky legislation empowers teachers more so than parents (a majority of council members are teachers), the Illinois legislation places parents in the majority. Parents have the ultimate power on Chicago's site-based councils.

Reform in Chicago is not without its problems. Reformers have continually met with opposition from central office bureaucrats. As a result twenty pro-

reform groups have united under the banner of the Alliance for Better Chicago Schools (ABC). In attempting to highlight the opposition to site-based councils by the central office, ABC issued a "report card" on the central bureaucracy. Their report pointed to ten areas where the central bureaucratic organization was deficient. The coalition suggested that the central board was deficient in "providing accurate information and support to local school councils, simplifying staff hiring and principal selection, speeding purchase orders and deliveries, providing clear guidance for curriculum and instruction, and developing what it calls 'honest systems' for measuring student progress" (Rist, 1990, p. 24).

School reform in Chicago has consistently remained an embattled process. The current reform effort has been in and out of a state of limbo. Quite recently, however, Pierce (1991) reports that Chicago's education reformers met with some success. The Illinois Legislature "has just overturned a court decision that questioned the constitutionality of the voting base for the 6,000-plus local school committee members" (p. 8). In addressing the issue of the election of school committee members, the legislature opened up voting rights to all members of a given community, not just the parents. Chicago's first massive attempt at "grassroots" governance continues.

Conclusion to the Era of New Federalism

It is quite difficult to assess that which is currently taking place in American school governance and educational administration. Scholars seem to be in direct opposition to each other. However, one striking feature seems to be emerging. When discussing either centralization or decentralization, an individual's perspective is of primary importance. Under the New Federalism plans of the Nixon, Reagan and Bush administrations, there has indeed been a divestiture of authority from the national level to the state level. Clearly it would appear that the national government is significantly decentralizing its control over American school governance and educational administration. Power and authority have been handed down to the state level.

From the local, community point of view, power over American school governance and educational administration has been centralized to the state level, with many states taking control over such school policies as the length of the school year, curriculum and textbook adoption. However, at the state level, decentralization seems to be the view.

Some states have mandated control of school governance to the specific schools, as is true in the State of Kentucky and the City of Chicago. In those two locations, site-based management seems to be the rule

rather than the exception. Complete control over the day-to-day operation of these schools has been transferred to teachers, parents and local school administrators. The locus of control, however, differs in each situation. In Chicago, parents are in control of school governance as they comprise the majority on the site-based school councils. In Kentucky, the teachers have been empowered with that authority, as they are the majority on that state's site-based councils.

CHAPTER 8

Conclusion: Prospects for the Future

> The intention is not so much to teach students about other times and places as to make them aware that their preferences are only that--accidents of their time and place (Bloom, 1987, p. 30).

This analysis of the evolution of American school governance and educational administration has taken us through nearly 340 years. The overall picture of its development reveals swings from decentralization to centralization, from centralization to decentralization, and a mixture of both philosophies. This concluding analysis begins with a review of the problems encountered when attempting to define the terms centralization and decentralization. It continues with a recapitulation of the actual manner in which American school governance operated over each given time period coupled with the varying arguments which proved successful in the adoption of either a centralist or decentralist philosophy. And finally, it concludes with a comparison of similar and dissimilar themes which emerged as each idea rose to dominance over American school governance and educational administration.

The Question of Definition: Evolution of a Term

Fantini and Gittell (1973) postulate that confusion over the definitions for decentralization have arisen because of the frequently loose terminology associated with the concept. They suggest that "there are those who insist that decentralization refers only to an administrative practice moving from central staffing to field operations ... [which is considered to be] a traditional definition" (Fantini and Gittell, 1973, p. 127). The manner in which the terms centralization and decentralization have evolved is as significant as the forms of governance.

But definitions of centralization and decentralization change as society changes and attitudes toward government and business shift. The earliest term used for centralization observed (1640s) was "consociation." It evolved as a non-threatening term evoked for use in the unification of the four principal colonies in New England--Massachusetts Bay, Plymouth, Connecticut and New Haven. Colonists used the term not as a vehicle for the relinquishing individual colonial powers, but as a way to unite primarily for economic and trading purposes. The notion of relinquishing of an individual colony's sovereign powers was never considered as part of the consociation pact. Centralization in the early evolution of American

national governance can be defined as a contract designed to foster a richer economy with better coordination of trade.

By the late 1700s, around 1788, centralization of effort for economic and trading purposes evolved to a "confederation" of effort (the Articles of Confederation and Perpetual Union) and included the ideas of power and governance. By this time, the definition of centralization evolved to include the development of a central government designed to replace British rule. Still the idea of self-government (state's rights) remained crucial to each state. Confederation, implying centralization by its very definition, actually meant decentralization because this confederation was more a delegation of powers rather that a union of powers. "Each state [retained] its sovereignty, freedom, and independence, and every power, jurisdiction and right ... the better to serve and perpetuate mutual friendships and intercourse among the people... (American's Guide, 1820?, p. 373).

By the end of the eighteenth century, the terms consolidation and power were united. "The first principle upon which governments are formed," one author wrote, "is this: that consolidation produces power" (Constitutional Compromises, 1851, p. 385). Clearly, the battles waged over the adoption of the American Constitution reveal that the term "union" was used as a

non-threatening way to wrangle power and control away from the many (interpreted as the less able, the uneducated) and place it into the hands of the few (interpreted as the more able, the educated).

The early nineteenth century witnessed the birth of the term "centralization" and its alignment to the concepts of authority and power. Its first documented use was in 1801 in the Neolog French Dictionary when referring to a centralized government. Its subsequent use clearly reveals the fear evoked by the term. For in 1822, someone wrote "centralization--that ferocious hydra which has preyed upon...Europe for a century" (Annals Register, 1822, II, p. 793 in Simpson 1989).

The term "decentralization," simultaneously, was used to indicate a division of authority. It appeared in the vocabulary somewhat later, around 1846, and was almost immediately aligned with the notion of power (Simpson, 1989). Its meaning quite naturally was derived from centralization and was defined as the act of "undoing" centralization. More specifically, during the early nineteenth century, this division usually referred to school districts, for while the national government was in the midst of centralizing its control, school governance remained decentralist in its control.

By the turn of the twentieth century, the terms "centralization" and "decentralization" were commonplace. Very little attention was paid to

analyzing the meaning of either concept until the middle of that century. By the late 1950s specific meanings of each concept assumed a prominence heretofore unheard of.

In the 1960s the definition of decentralization shifted from an administrative one (primarily representing a deconcentration of administration) to a political one, and when this shift occurred, so too did the incorporation of the notion of power. The shift in the 1960s to a more political framework "involved not an integral bureaucratic reorganization but non-bureaucratic community agencies" (Fantini and Gittell, 1973, p. 127).

Types of Decentralization Reviewed

Frequently the concept of decentralization is divided into three specific types: administrative decentralization, political decentralization and participative decentralization. "Administrative decentralization involves the delegation of authority from superior to subordinate in a bureaucracy. The subordinate, however, continues to remain dependent on his superior..." (Zimet, 1973, p. 3). It is characterized by the "delivery of certain services to local areas, with control remaining at the top level. Local civil servants carry out the mandates of their superiors" (Fantini and Gittell, 1973, p. 129). In this

type of decentralization, only negligible amounts of power (authority) are transferred from superordinate to subordinate.

As Fantini and Gittell (1973) illustrate in developing a rationale for this concept, "some view decentralization simply as an administrative device--as a shift in administration from the national to the state or city government ... administrative adjustments are necessary but not sufficient for this kind of decentralization because these adjustments can be accomplished without ... transferring power" (Fantini and Gittell, 1973, p. 12). This failure to transfer power has led to the evolution of the term "deconcentration." Deconcentration within this context is defined as decentralizing paperwork while all the decision-making functions, the real control, authority and power, remain centralized.

A second type of decentralization, and one which has not been researched as much in the literature, is participative decentralization. As defined by Edward N. Costikyan, with participative decentralization "there is some limited input by local residents in creating or implementing policy" (Fantini and Gittell, 1973, p. 130). With his definition of participative decentralization, Costikyan introduces the concept of power, but notes that it is mainly absent from this type of decentralization. Almost characteristically, as with

administrative decentralization, there is no shift of power, that key ingredient which has been defined as a primary characteristic of decentralization. Fantini and Gittell (1973) note that participative decentralization can be of two types: program creation and program implementation. With participative decentralization as program creation, the community is included in the creation of policy as it relates to some (but not all) programs. In participative decentralization as program implementation, clear lines of authority are drawn between central and local governing bodies. Some services are supervised locally with this type of decentralization (Fantini and Gittell, 1973).

Political decentralization, on the other hand, involves the transfer of authority to officials who have been selected and who are dependent upon the subjurisdictional electorate or clientele (Zimet (1973). Terms such as "community control," "local control," or "local autonomy" seem to characterize this shifting of power or authority from superordinate to subordinate. If Zimet's definition is correct, then with political decentralization there is a legitimate shift in power.

In reviewing this historical analysis of the evolution of American school governance and educational administration, one can readily see the recurrence of these three types of decentralization. Tables 4, 5, and 6 depict each of the three types of

decentralization, together with those events which indicated the decentralization effort in that particular direction. Collectively, these three tables show representative occurrences of each type of decentralization effort throughout American educational history.

TABLE 4

Administrative Decentralization and Selected Examples Which Reflect That Movement

Type of Decentralization	Event Depicting Movement
Administrative	1. Turn of Twentieth century vision of role of the school superintendency
	2. Chicago's decentralization efforts under Redmond
	3. Initial reform efforts in Los Angeles in 1970
	6. Initial reform efforts in Detroit in late 1960s and early 1970s

As Table 4 illustrates, administrative decentralization, that is, that type of decentralization which is chiefly characterized by a delegation of authority from superordinate to subordinate within a bureaucracy with the subordinate remaining dependent upon the superordinate. This type of decentralization has been continually tried throughout American national history as well as throughout American school governance and educational administration.

An historical example of administrative decentralization in American school governance and educational administration appears early in the twentieth century and centers around educational administration's vision of the role of the school superintendency. As DeWeese (1900) pointed out, educators were handicapped by political obligations and oftentimes were harassed by school board members. As a result, there existed a lack of uniformity in both the selection of and the assignment of responsibilities of the school superintendent. The logic which dominated a view of the role of the superintendency was that the superintendent should be the directing force behind the educational machinery and likewise be held responsible for the success or failure of that system. The end result of this kind of logic led to an administratively decentralized superintendency with a central governing agency (DeWeese, 1900).

James Redmond's 1967 plan for the administrative decentralization of the Chicago's school governance centered around the creation of deputy superintendents. He suggested that these superintendents would be able to be more responsive to community needs. However, Redmond's plan retained a central governing staff. His creation of "Citizen Advisory Councils" had one primary purpose--to advise administrators on decisions. His effort reflected an administratively decentralized office with real authority remaining centralized.

The city of Los Angeles presents yet another example of administrative decentralization. As O'Shea (1975) pointed out, the County Board of Education, responding to demands for educational reform, created school level community advisory boards. No authority was shifted from superordinate to subordinate. Communities councils merely functioned in an advisory capacity.

Another example of administrative decentralization in American school governance is reflected in the initial reform efforts of Detroit superintendent Norman Drachler in the late 1960s. In 1968 Drachler instituted a reorganization plan aimed at decentralizing some of the administrative decision-making processes. What the Board, under Drachler's leadership, did was merely to allow school principals more authority in running their

individual schools, but it did not decentralize real power. The principals remained dependent upon the superintendency.

TABLE 5

Political Decentralization and Selected Examples Which Reflect That Movement

Type of Decentralization	Events Depicting Movement
Political	1. 1817 Massachusetts school districts made corporations with power to sue and enforce contracts
	2. 1828 Massachusetts districts obtained sole control in all matters except in the examination of teachers
	3. Detroit reform after 1968
	4. New York City reform after 1970
	5. Kentucky 1990 school reform
	6. Chicago 1990 school reform

Table 5 highlights selected examples of political decentralization, that is, the transfer of authority to officials who have been selected and who are dependent upon the subjurisdictional electorate or clientele.

Two early prime examples of political decentralization efforts occurred in the state of Massachusetts, and both efforts focused on the school district as a political entity. In 1817, Massachusetts school districts were made corporations and as such held the power to make and enforce contracts. Eleven years later, in 1828, these same districts acquired the power to control individual districts in all matters except that of the examination of teachers.

Some contemporary examples of political decentralization center around school reform efforts. And once again cities of Chicago, New York City, and Detroit coupled with the state effort in Kentucky dominate recent examples of political decentralization.

The example of Detroit, Michigan as one of political decentralization is the weakest of all because there exists within its reform framework only a "hint" of it. After repeated legislative battles and negotiations with the Black community, the reorganization of Detroit's public school system into eight regions became effective January 1, 1971. These reform efforts, however, remain somewhat disappointing.

Rogers (1982) reported that after nearly twenty years of unrest and turbulence, New York City began a critical social experiment in delegating control over its elementary and junior high schools to individual communities. The goal of New York's political decentralization plan was to place power into the hands of community councils.

The city of Chicago and the State of Kentucky are the more recent examples of political decentralization of American school governance and educational administration. Kentucky, with its Education Reform Act of 1990, has mandated control of school governance to the specific schools. Chicago's School Reform Act of 1988 repositioned the Chicago school governance structure to the school site. In both these examples, site-based management has become the rule rather than the exception. It appears as though complete control over the day-to-day operations of these schools has been transferred to teachers, parents and local school administrators.

TABLE 6

Participative Decentralization and Selected Examples Which Reflect That Movement

Type of Decentralization	Events Depicting Movement
Participative	1. Massachusetts Legislative Act of 1642
	2. Massachusetts Legislative Act of 1647
	3. Old Deluder Satan Act
	4. Chicago school reform of the 1970s
	5. Los Angeles reform efforts of the 1970s

Table 6 highlights some examples of participative decentralization in American school governance and educational administration. Participative decentralization is defined as that type of decentralization in which there exists some limited input by local residents in creating or implementing policy. It differs from political decentralization in that it does not provide for independent, locally elected councils, control of service and budget-making power. Local councils under this type of decentralization have little or marginal powers. This type of decentralization is difficult to identify, but some examples can be observed in the history of American school governance and educational administration.

The Massachusetts Legislative Act of 1642 and the Compulsory Education Law of 1647 represent a mixture of controls over educational governance. While these acts held the universal provision of education to the Commonwealth's youth to be of paramount importance, it placed the obligation for providing that education on the parents and guardians. No local governing councils were provided for and the State retained the authority to fix the standard of education.

Participation appears to have been mandated with the passage of the Old Deluder Satan Act in 1647. Without mentioning locally controlled governing councils, this act required that every town that "shall

increase to the number of one hundred families or householders, ... shall set up a grammar school" (Palfrey, 1860, p. 263).

Reform efforts within the City of Los Angeles school system reflect elements of participative decentralization. As the Board of Education fought reform advocates--Blacks and Mexican Americans--a compromise of participative decentralization was reached. The Board of Education created school level community advisory councils whose responsibility was to deal with some issues (such as environmental ones) and thereby make the Board more responsive to the needs of the community.

In a similar vein, the city of Chicago instituted advisory councils as the second educational decentralization reform effort in the early 1970s. It was assumed with this type of citizen participation, the Board of Education would become more responsive to the needs of local communities.

Administrative, Participative, then Political Decentralization

An analysis of these three types of decentralization efforts reveals an interesting sequence of events. In descending order of priority, centralist advocates, when faced with the dilemma of decentralizing some measure of their control over American school

governance and educational administration, propose types of decentralization from the most to the least desirable from their power-oriented position.

As we have already seen with contemporary reform efforts in New York City, Chicago, Detroit, and Los Angeles, for example, administrative decentralization--a parceling of paper work with no transfer of power or authority from superordinate (the central governing board) to subordinate (the local school or school district) was nearly universally offered as the "solution" to making educational administration more responsive to community needs.

When community or local control advocates appeared to be dissatisfied with the board's attempts to reform educational governance without releasing measurable amounts of power, participative decentralization, was a transfer of some responsibilities but no real authority (power).

Inch by inch, central governing boards eventually faced the inevitability of educational reform brought about by the real transfer of power and authority--political decentralization. As a last effort in all four reform efforts examined, political decentralization was offered only after administrative and participative decentralization efforts failed.

This sequences of power acquisition (either centralist or decentralist in nature depending upon the source of power emanation) bears further study as it relates to contemporary educational reform efforts.

Defining a Centralization/Decentralization Continuum

Just as difficulties are revealed and discussed as they relate to a centralized form of government, so too, have decentralist difficulties been highlighted. Fesler (1965) identified three problem areas which inhibit the accurate assessment of decentralization. He claimed that (1) the language used in discussing decentralization dichotomizes centralization and decentralization and that there appears to be no term that embraces the full continuum; (2) since the concept of power is so complex, no accurate indices have been developed which can measure either concept accurately; and (3) there is a problem in differentiating degrees of decentralization and centralization.

By contrast, however, Porter and Olsen (1976) point to positive aspects of both concepts of centralization and decentralization. Their analysis revealed that the mid-twentieth century experienced "waves of proposals to decentralize government at all levels. This trend first gained currency at local levels, culminating in a broad movement supporting neighborhood and community governments" (Porter and Olsen, 1976, p.

72). Their study examined various conceptualizations of the critical issues in both governmental centralization and decentralization. These researchers tied values, tasks and organizational structure to both centralist and decentralist arguments and contended that both ideas of centralization and decentralization in government have broad appeal in the United States. "Decentralized systems promote participation, access, and responsiveness; centralized systems favor participation, efficiency, professionalism and the use of advanced or expensive technologies" (Porter and Olsen, 1976, p. 75).

Anrig (1963) pointed out some of the social factors which influenced resistance to school consolidations and he called for further research. In doing so, he identified nine areas where social resistance occurs. These areas include custom, size of the merger, competition of the community, the socio-economic structure, inter-community rivalry, provincialization, school patronage, public involvement and vested interest. "These ... factors ... seem to clearly influence resistance to school district reorganization ... they each have sociological implications commonly encountered in reorganization efforts" (Anrig, 1963, p. 164).

However, in approaching perceived opposition from a human need perspective, Humphreys (1952) addresses the importance of a consideration of human relations, teacher-principal relationships, and home-school relationships. In contrast to Anrig's nine sociological resistances, she identified these three human relations issues as "key problems" in school consolidations. Principals, Humphreys suggests, should neither be rigid nor undemocratic; yet, they should be firm.

Evolution of American School Governance: Comprehensive Analysis

During the Colonial Period the dominant argument of American school governance was one of consociation; that is, the consolidation of effort. However, in actuality, the dominant method was decentralist in nature. While arguments abounded for the centralization of power, state sovereignty ruled and individual state control remained prevalent. The American people faced the task of the formation of a national government which would be suitable to a majority of its people. At that same time, attention turned to the establishment of an educational network available to all the people. Early American school governance and educational administration was highly decentralized in nature. And no one argued that it should not be so. Responsibility for the provision of education rested with either

parents or specific townships. Common practice during these early days was to create another school as soon as the employment of a second teacher became a necessity.

A decentralist philosophy dominated American school governance and educational administration throughout much of the nineteenth century. Although contemporary scholarship (Martin, 1894; Draper, 1894; Tyack, 1974) seems to indicate that centralization dominated, such was, in fact, not the case. While it can be conceded that centralization of larger metropolitan areas was rapidly taking hold, decentralization remained the rule rather then the exception over most of the nation. Rural areas held fast to the notion that the one-room school was of primary importance to the welfare, not only of the students who attended them, but also of the maintenance of the culture and well-being of the community as well. A community used the school facility as the focal point for social activities.

As the nineteenth century approached its close, around 1882, centralization of American school governance and educational administration took a firm hold. Successful arguments for centralized control led the way to dominance of centralization over American school governance. The reasons for the success of centralist advocates are many and varied. Most successful reasonings centered around transportation and economic arguments. This form of centralized control,

however, was centralized only to the district or state levels. Rarely did the national government become centrally involved in American school governance to a significant degree until the mid-twentieth century.

Centralization of control continued to gain prominence and strengthen its hold on education. The federal government became increasingly involved up to and through the Presidential administration of Lyndon B. Johnson. The national government sought to become increasingly more involved in the provision of education to its citizens. Civil rights legislation, education legislation, and grants to those in need became commonplace.

The republican administrations of Richard M. Nixon, Ronald Reagan and George Bush highlight a new trend in the evolution of American school governance and educational administration. The national government seems to be distancing itself from the highly centralist philosophies of the democratic administrations of John F. Kennedy and Lyndon B. Johnson. Much of the authority, power and control of school governance has been transferred to the individual states with individual states passing this control to the district and county levels.

Beginning with the presidential administration of Richard M. Nixon, continuing and significantly expanding throughout the administrations of Ronald Reagan and

George Bush, there has been a divestiture of authority from the federal level to the state level. The national government has been steadily decentralizing its control over American school governance and educational administration. Motivated primarily by economic measures, the federal government has passed most power and authority (political decentralization) to the individual states. This political decentralization was highlighted with the passage of the Education Consolidation and Reform Act of 1981.

Some states, in turn, have legislatively mandated control over school governance to the specific schools--not specific school districts, but to specific schools. The states of Kentucky and Illinois have been the first states as we enter into the decade of the 1990s to transfer complete control to the school site itself. These two states have transferred management of the day-to-day operations of the schools in their states to teachers, parents and school administrators. In Chicago, Illinois transfer of authority and power (both administrative and political decentralization) has been transferred to the parents. Parents are the majority on the site-based councils established in each school. In Kentucky, control has been placed in the hands of the teachers because they comprise the majority of membership on the state's school site-based councils.

While these site-based councils wield a measurable amount of power, much of the power remains at the central office. Such matters as the development of the curriculum and funding, remain within the purview of the central office. As we have seen, in Kentucky, for example, the "school boards retain a host of powers--including broad policy-making authority and the authority to levy taxes" (Harrington-Lueker, 1990, p. 18).

Additionally, school boards in Kentucky retain the responsibilities of selecting the superintendent, planning, budgeting, curriculum, making oral contracts, providing pupil transportation and establishing the tax rate (Harrington-Lueker, 1990).

The Rationale Used for Centralization of American School Governance

It is important at this point to analyze the most common and most successful arguments used by proponents for a centralist philosophy of governance. We shall see which were successful and attempt to determine why these arguments won the support of the American people.

In order to understand fully the successful centralist rationale, the arguments and counter-arguments for each era previously studied are highlighted, with tabular synthesis beginning each analysis. We will review centralization versus

decentralization arguments and counter-arguments and note the similarities and dissimilarities of each argument as these arguments evolved.

TABLE 7

Rationale for the Adoption of a Centralist or a Decentralist Form of Governance: The Colonial Period

Centralization	Decentralization
1. Mutual help and strength in future concerns	Loss of state sovereignty would result
2. Benefit economy and trading	Destruction of Republic
3. Replace British rule	Loss of suffrage
4. Perpetuate mutual friendship among people of all states	Sacrifice individual liberties
5. Common defense of union	Monarchy would develop
6. Preservation of public people	Enslavement of the peace
7. Regulation of commerce	Destruction of state powers

Table 7 reveals that in these early days in the evolution of American school governance and educational administration as well as the evolution of an American national governance, concern was over the help one citizen, state or governing body would be able to provide another.

At the national level, unification was threatened by decentralist advocates because of a fear of the development of a monarchy, resulting in tyranny, destruction of the republic, enslavement of the people and a loss of state sovereignty. Centralists argued that unification was necessary for mutual self-help, improved and more efficient trading with a subsequent strengthening of the economies of each united state. Additionally, they countered that unification would provide for the common defense, perpetuate mutual friendship among the people of all the states and aid in the preservation of peace. A centralist philosophy eventually won over a decentralist one as a unified country developed a centralized national government.

In American school governance, however, such was not the case. Education was looked upon as being totally the responsibility of the parent, the township or the individual state. In these early days in the evolution of American school governance and educational administration, each school was considered an autonomous unit. Parents, teachers and local townspeople held

control over its provision, content, and size. The system was so highly decentralized in nature that as the student population of each school grew in size to the point of another teacher being a necessity, a new school was created. Each school was its own district. The primary argument for the creation of this method of school governance was that individual locales were better able to meet the educational needs of the children in their own areas.

The chief reason for even the development of an educational system at all during the infancy of American school governance was religious in nature. The first piece of legislation aimed at the provision of education, the Old Deluder Satan Act of 1642, insisted that schooling would thwart Old Deluder Satan because an educated populace would better be able to read and to understand the scriptures.

TABLE 8

Rationale for the Adoption of a Centralist or a Decentralist Form of Governance: The Federalist Period

Centralization	Decentralization
1. Happiness, prosperity, peace and security	Consolidation produces power
2. Connects states closely together	Loss of suffrage, increased tax burden
3. Needs of the many provided better if rule by few (educated)	Fosters aristocratic elite, monarchy
4. Offer universal education, better governance, quality increased	Loss of native language other than English
5. Democratization of schools	Break down social barriers better left intact

Table 8--Rationale for the Adoption of a Centralist or a Decentralist Form of Governance: The Federalist Period--highlights the rationale used by centralist and decentralist advocates as they grappled with the evolution of a national government and with an effective manner of school governance. Once again we see centralist advocates on the offensive, and once more the rationale used for the adoption of a centralist over a decentralist manner of governance centered along similar lines.

Chief among the reasons touted for the adoption of a centralist form of national governance were for the happiness, prosperity, peace, and security of the inhabitants of the country. States would be better connected together, with rule by the few fostering democracy. Clearly, the centralist forces won over the decentralist forces as the United States Constitution was ratified.

Decentralist advocates once again argued that centralization would lead to the development of a monarchy, loss of suffrage, increased tax burden on the American people. Consolidation, decentralists argued, produced power. And power was something many in the country feared.

American school governance remained highly decentralized. In fact, during the Federalist period, decentralization of school governance was in its heyday.

School districts continued to evolve, with numerous school districts oftentimes within the same township. If school governance was centralized, decentralists argued, there would be a breakdown in needed social barriers, increased tax burden--and some feared a loss of their native language as the adoption of English as the national language would solely be taught in the common schools.

TABLE 9

Rationale for the Adoption of a Centralist or a Decentralist Form of Governance: Reconstruction

Centralization	Decentralization
1. Universal education essential for common good	Leads away from democracy
2. Unification of townships	Aristocracy, monarchy would develop
3. All children afforded same education, health benefits	Not all children need same
4. Provides solution of keeping farm boys home	Breaks down needed social barriers
5. Future characterized by strong competition, increased technology	
6. Better school system, security for teachers, consistent curriculum	Loss of control over children's education by parents
7. Better control over educational governance	Loss of local control
8. Increased effectiveness of common schools	

Table 9--Rationale for the Adoption of a Centralist or a Decentralist Form of Governance: Reconstruction--highlights the increasing ascendancy of a centralist over a decentralist philosophy at both the national governmental level and in American school governance. While at the national level centralization continued to dominate the manner of governance, decentralists began losing control over American school governance.

Decentralists argued that the centralization of school governance would lead schools away from democracy, that not all children could or should be taught in the same manner, and that needed social barriers would be broken down. Fear of a loss of local control over school policy and curriculum dominated the arguments of decentralist advocates.

Centralists countered that universal education was in the best interest of the entire country and that centralization of educational effort would provide this education to all children, regardless of their socio-economic status or the locale in which they lived. Centralists argued that technology was advancing at such a rapid rate that farm boys needed knowledge of the most recent technological advances in farming. Centralization would, centralists stated, provide the avenue for keeping the "farm boy on the farm."

Besides addressing the social benefits derived from a centralized provision of education, centralists argued that the centralization would unify townships and produce better schools with a consistent curriculum and better teachers. Teachers would have better job security, and centralization would increase the effectiveness of the common schools.

At this point in the evolution of American school governance, centralist proponents assumed an offensive role while decentralists assumed a defensive one. A shift in dominance of centralist over decentralist governance begins to occur during this time, but it does not fully assume dominance until the turn of the twentieth century.

TABLE 10

Rationale for the Adoption of a Centralist or a Decentralist Form of Governance: The Modern Period

Centralization	Decentralization
1. Better teachers, higher salaries, teaching enhanced	Transportation danger demise of farm life
2. More efficient school board, administration, curriculum	Hamstrings local initiative
3. Greater specialization of instruction, allows for student grouping	Will not provide farm boys with special instruction
4. Better pupil stimulation, socialization, able to meet needs of "special" children	Elimination of some needed rural area services
5. Improved economic management, equalization of tax burden	Limitations placed on expenditures by local communities
6. Better facilities with purchase of minimum of equipment	Abandoned one-room schools become homes for vagrants
7. Schools free of political manipulation	Loss of rural values
8. Provides students with best of everything	Good enough before, is now
9. Schools become social centers for community to gather	Deprives farmers of local community centers
	Depreciation of property values

Once again, as Table 10 indicates, centralists were on the offensive, decentralists on the defensive. Proponents of the centralization of American school governance and educational administration reasoned that better teachers who could be paid higher salaries would result. Efficiency seemed to dominate the centralist mind-set. There would be a more efficient school board, more efficient administration, more efficient curriculum. There would be a greater specialization of instruction with students being stimulated more, be better socialized, and the needs of "special" students would be better met.

In addition, centralists argued that through a consolidated effort improved economic management would result with an equalization of the tax burden. Schools would be free of political manipulation, become social centers for the community to gather, and students would, as a result, be provided with the "best of everything."

Decentralists countered, though unsuccessfully so, that consolidation of schools and school governance would produce transportation dangers and lead to a demise of farm life. It would not provide farm boys with the special instruction which they needed, and hamstring local initiative. Abandoned one-room school houses would become homes for vagrants. There would be a depreciation of property values and a loss of community centers. There would be a subsequent loss of

rural values, and more importantly, if decentralized school governance was "good enough for our forefathers, it is certainly good enough for us."

TABLE 11

Rationale for the Adoption of a Centralist or a Decentralist Form of Governance: The Contemporary Period

Centralization	Decentralization
1. Richer program development	Lack of responsiveness to community needs
2. More educational services able to offer 12-year program	Loss of individualized attention
3. Better, more efficient leadership	Bigger does not mean better
4. Broader tax base, more efficient use of tax dollars with greater savings to tax payers	Taxes will increase, savings lost by creation of monolithic bureaucracy
5. Continuity of curriculum	Less parental and community involvement
6. Quality of education same for every child	Poor quality of education, loss of community involvement
	Transportation dangers to students

Table 11--Rationale for the Adoption of a Centralist or a Decentralist Form of Governance: The Contemporary Period--brings to the forefront some changes in the centralist but not in the decentralist rationale. The centralization arguments presented here have come to be viewed as a somewhat traditional centralist position.

Centralists expanded their rationale for the maintenance of a centralist form of governance by pointing to higher program development, better and more efficient leadership and a continuity of curriculum. They suggested that the quality of education was the same for every child and more educational services were being offered the student population. Additionally, centralists claimed that these educational advances were the result of a consolidated effort and were derived from a broader tax base and a more efficient use of those tax dollars.

Decentralists continued to argue that a loss of local control meant a loss of responsiveness to a community's needs, increased dangers to the students through more frequent use of mass transportation, and a loss of individualized student attention. The suggestion was also made that taxes would increase and any perceived savings would disappear by the creation of

a monolithic bureaucracy. The loss of parental and community involvement would result in "bigger not being better."

TABLE 12

Rationale for the Adoption of a Centralist or a Decentralist Form of Governance: The Period of New Federalism

Centralization	Decentralization
1. Makes teachers more responsive	Makes teachers more to students' needs
2. Reform already underway	Lead to educational innovation, reform
3. Impeded integration, less minority involvement	Greater parental and public participation with more minority involvement
4. Local boards already select the most able, better qualified	Better teachers, principals and school board members
5. More efficient use of education dollars	Promotes self-government

Table 12--Rationale for the Adoption of a Centralist or a Decentralist Form of Governance: The Period of New Federalism--demonstrates the shift from a centralist to a decentralist form of American school governance and educational administration. Decentralist forces assumed an aggressive role as the country, in general, begins to shift control.

Centralist rationale argued that centralized boards already select the best teachers and administrators, were more responsive to individual school needs, and made more efficient use of education dollars. Reform was in progress, and a decentralization of administration and effort would impede racial integration and lessen minority involvement in the educational process.

Decentralists successfully have argued that site-based management would make teachers more responsive to the needs of the students. Teacher empowerment would lead to more effective schools and more effective teaching. Decentralization of American school governance would lead to innovation and reform and greater parental and public participation resulting in more minority involvement in educational governance. In addition, the promotion of self-government would lead to better teachers, principals and school board members. Decentralization is gaining ground under this "New

Federalism," and the rationale for the adoption of a decentralist over centralist manner of governance seems to be coming full circle.

Citation Analysis--Validation of Emerging Themes

In an effort to further illustrate those arguments which have been identified throughout an analysis of the centralization\decentralization debate, a subject\key word analysis of the titles and content of the published scholarship proved beneficial. Nearly 3,000 citations which directly applied to American school governance and educational administration were culled from the literature. Of those 3,300 citations, approximately 2,021 were selected as representative of the literature in general, and the remainder represented isolated or limited areas of interest. Those citations represent 180 specific assigned subject headings which we shall term "emerging themes." Table 13 ranks the 16 most dominant themes, beginning with the most frequently occurring theme.

TABLE 13

Dominant Emerging Centralization/Decentralization Themes

(In order by frequency)

Emerging Theme	Frequency of Citations
Rural Schools	117
School Districts	114
Local Control	89
Planning	89
Economics and Finance	83
Consolidation	82
Laws and Legislation	79
Policy and Policy Making	69
Administration	68
Community Control (Involvement)	53
Transportation	45
Control	41
Higher Education	40
School Based Management (Site)	39
School Decentralization	31

Collectively these sixteen headings account for 1,095 of the bibliographic citations identified with the centralization/decentralization literature which surrounds the American school governance and educational administration literature, or approximately 54% of that literature. One can conclude, therefore, that these are the dominant emerging themes which have evolved from the literature. But how do these terms compare with that which has been identified through the history of the debate?

One argument which appears consistently throughout the literature has been that of some form of local control. Almost from the first argument, concepts of the town, the farm, or the community were used as an emotional appeal to sway the public toward supporting the notion of local control. Drawing from Table 13, 222 citations evoke the local control argument (Community Control or Involvement, Control, Local Control and School Based or Site Management). This seems to corroborate the identification of the local control rationale used consistently through time.

It logically follows that the concept of local control would dominate the centralization and decentralization debate. The town-meeting philosophy guided the colonists as they sought the best manner in which to provide an education for the inhabitants of their own communities. Their involvement afforded them

a measure of control, and with that control came a feeling of responsibility in the education process. That same town-meeting philosophy of local control has indeed shown its importance and relevance today. In Chicago and the State of Kentucky, the town-meeting philosophy of local control (now labled "site-based management") has emerged.

The scholarship surrounding the community control argument reflects the general public's concern over its ability to maintain control over educational governance. Such titles as "Administrative Decentralization and Community Involvement," "Support For Community Control Among Urban Elites," "The Need For Community Control of Education," and "Participation, Decentralization, Community Control and Quality Education" represent the kinds and types of arguments which community control advocates used to gain attention and support for their decentralist cause.

Other themes which emerged through a citation analysis also closely relate to those identified earlier. As the twentieth century emerged, the attention of both centralist and decentralist advocates turned to the issue of transportation. Improved transportation technologies, that is, invention of the automobile and, more importantly, the school bus, brought to the forefront the idea of mass transportation of pupils. Almost all of the articles identified with

the emerging theme of transportation were written in the late 1920s and early 1930s and lent much support to the centralization advocacy.

Just as the town-meeting philosophy was successful in fostering the decentralization of American school governance and educational administration, the ability to transport pupils safely and efficiently from one district to another has played a key role in the success of centralization advocates. Mass transportation technologies removed time and distance barriers and helped to silence the decentralist supporters who argued for keeping the farm boy closer to home.

Representative samples of article titles reflecting the importance of transportation technologies to the ascendency of a centralist over a decentralist philosophy of American school governance and educational administration reflect the importance of this component in the evolution of American educational governance structure. "School Consolidation and the Conveyance of Children," "Consolidation of Schools and Transportation of Pupils," and "Motor Bus Raises Educational Standards: School Consolidation in Rural Districts Gives County Children Advantages Equal To City" are a representative sample of the plethora of articles revolving around the

importance of the ability to transport pupils efficiently, economically, and safely from one area to another in an effort to consolidate educational effort.

The economics of both centralization and decentralization issues were always being debated. It is, therefore, not surprising that the emerging theme "economics and finance" would appear in the literature. Eighty-three citations were directly aligned to the notion of economics, exclusive of any tax or taxation issue; if the twenty-six sources dealing directly with tax and taxation are added to the broader category of economics and finance, the citation total becomes 109.

The literature analysis strongly supports the economics and finance aspect of the centralists' arguments. "Schools: Pittsburgh Much-heralded Educational Superplan is Beset by Rising Costs and Raging Public Dissent," "Consolidation of High Schools as a Program of Efficiency and Economy," "Better Rural Schools For Less Cost," and "How Small Are Our Schools: Small Schools--Large Costs" are just a sample of the titles of articles revolving around the economics of school consolidation efforts.

Suggestions for Further Research

This dissertation has traced the evolution of the establishment and development of American school governance and educational administration. In so doing,

an order to the debate of the manner of governance has been established as well as shifts in dominance of decentralist and centralist philosophies highlighted. It offers alternative views to traditional scholarship concerning the dominant method of American school governance and educational administration from the seventeenth through nineteenth centuries and identifies the dominating social influences which have led to shifts from either a centralized or decentralized form of governance. Additionally it calls to the forefront the words of David Tyack (1974) when he wrote that ...Organizations shape and are shaped by the larger social system, they also ... have a life of their own which influences the behavior of their members" (p. 9).

While the indications of this dissertation are provocative, findings regarding the era of New Federalism are, at best, preliminary. Further investigation of the current trend which seems to be taking hold of American school governance and educational administration, that of site-based management, can advance scholarship and contribute to a better understanding of contemporary trends. It appears that contemporary American school governance and educational administration are mirroring some aspects of the governance structure which existed in the early town meeting days where the local community held complete control over school governance. The town-meeting

philosophy which guided an infant school governance (with modifications reflecting today's advanced technology) is that same philosophy which appears to be guiding a nearly four hundred year old school governance system.

These findings call to the forefront several policy-related questions. If site-based management and site-based councils are to be successful, what measure of control must be relinquished by the school board to foster this success? And what implications does this hold for policy formulation and implementation? Scholarship might further be served if one studies the impact that site-based councils and site-based management have on schools of choice and the use of education vouchers.

Another area which for further research would be to examine the influence of decentralization, that is, site-based management or site-based councils, on multicultural education. Scholars (Raschert, 1987; Bergen, 1987) point to initiative being taken by individual schools in incorporating foreign students into intercultural activities in schools. Additionally they point to the possibilities which exist for such schools to promote intercultural activities.

Scholarship might further be enhanced by comparing the educational reform movement currently underway in Japan with reform efforts in the United States. Current efforts in Japan point to a shift from prior centralized control to a more decentralized manner of governance aimed at individual student progress and development (Shimahara, 1986). Similarities and dissimilarities in the rationale used for the adoption of a decentralized manner of governance over a centralized manner of governance between the two countries might shed further light on the entire governance debate.

This study additionally points to an issue which seems to be coming to the forefront as site-based councils, with their differing compositions, evolve. Teacher empowerment (evidenced in Kentucky) as opposed to parental control (evidenced in Chicago) call to the forefront the notion of professionalism versus democracy. What might become the long term effects of teacher versus parental empowerment on American school governance and educational administration? One interesting study would be a comparison of overall school effectiveness between teacher empowering school systems and parental empowering school systems. Such a study might assist other educational administrators as they wrestle with the notion of the most appropriate and responsive educational governance.

REFERENCES

Abel, J. F. (1923). Consolidation of schools and the transportation of pupils. Bureau of Education Bulletin, 41, 1-135.

Abel, J. F. (1923). Motor bus raises educational standards: School consolidation in rural districts gives county children advantages equal to city. n. p. : National Automobile Chamber of Commerce.

Adams, F. (1969). The free school system of the United States. New York: Arno Press.

Allen, F. L. (1931). Only yesterday: An informal history of the nineteen-twenties. New York: Harper and Row.

Allen, F. L. (1940). Still yesterday: The nineteen-thirties in America, September 3, 1929-September 3, 1939. New York: Harper and Row.

Allen, W. B., Lloyd, G., & Lloyd, M. (1985). The essential antifederalist. New York: University Press of America.

American Association of School Administrators. (1958). The point of beginning: The local school district. Washington, D. C.: Author.

American Association of School Administrators. (1958). School district organization. Washington, D. C.: Author.

American Association of School Administrators. (1962). School district organization. Washington, D. C.: Author.

American slavery as it is: Testimony of a thousand witnesses. (1839). New York: The American Anti-slavery Society.

The American's guide: Comprising the Declaration of Independence; The Articles of Confederation; The Constitution of the United States, And the constitutions of several states. (182?). Philadelphia: Hogan & Thompson.

Andrews, S. (1866). The south since the war: As shown by fourteen weeks of travel and observation in Georgia and the Carolinas. Boston: Ticknor and Fields.

Anrig, G. R. (1969). The decentralization controversy. The Education Digest, 51, 125-127.

Anrig, G. R. (1963). Sociological factors which resist school consolidations. The Clearing House, 38, 161-164.

Are the United States a nation? (1864). Brownson's Weekly Review, 1(IV), 385-420.

Arp, J. B. (1919). Rural education and the consolidated school. New York: World Book Company.

Avary, M. L. (1906). Dixie after the war: An exposition of social conditions existing in the South, During the twelve years succeeding the fall of Richmond. New York: Doubleday, Page & Company.

Bailyn, B. (1960). Education in the forming of American society: Needs and opportunities for study. Chapel Hill, NC: The University of North Carolina Press.

Baker, G. G. (1990/1991). Open enrollment and curriculum centralization in Acton, Massachusetts. Educational Leadership, 48(4), 44-47.

Ballagh, J. C. (1970). The letters of Richard Henry Lee. Volume 1: 1762-1778. New York: Da Capo Press.

Ballagh, J. C. (1970). The letters of Richard Henry Lee. Volume 2: 1779-1794. New York: Da Capo Press.

Barclay, T. S. (1962). The St. Louis Home Rule Charter of 1876: Its framing and adoption. Columbia: University of Missouri Press.

Barnes, G. H. (1957). The antislavery impulse 1830-1844. Gloucester, MA: Peter Smith.

Beck, H. H. (1898). Cuba's fight for freedom and war with Spain: A comprehensive, accurate and thrilling history of the Spanish kingdom and its latest and fairest Colony; The long struggle of Cuba for freedom and independence; The intervention of the United States and the fierce war with Spain that followed. A record of oppression and patriotism, of cruelty and of valor and above all of the triumph of the Stars and Stripes. Philadelphia: Globe Bible Publishing Co.

Bennett, W. H., (Ed.). (1978). Letters from the Federal Farmer to the Republican. University, AL: The University of Alabama Press.

Bergen, J. J. (1987). Current issues in Canadian education. Ontario, Canada: Canadian Society for the Study of Education.

Bernstein, A. (1988). The new federalism hasn't meant less government. Business Week, 3050, 110.

Billings, J. (1989). Top down/bottom up curriculum development. Thrust, 18, 18-19.

Binder, F. M. (1974). The age of the common school 1830-1865. New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Blake, C. E. (190?). Schools consolidation and the conveyance of children. Forum, 33, 103.

Blaustein, A. P., & Ferguson, C. C., Jr. (Eds.). (1957). Desegregation and the law: The meaning and effect of the school segregation cases. New Jersey: Rutgers University Press.

Blaustein, A. P., & Zangrando, R. L. (Eds.). (1968). Civil rights and the American negro. New York: Trident Press.

Blose, D. T. (1936). Some consolidation statistics. School Life, 21, 223-224.

Borg, W. R., & Gall, M. D. (1983). Educational research: An introduction. New York: Longman.

Boulding, K. E. (1990). Three faces of power. London: Sage Publications.

Bourne, E. G. (1901). The Federalist: A commentary on the constitution of the United States. (Vols. 1-2). New York: M. Walter Dunne.

Boyd, W. L., & O'Shea, D. W. (1975). Theoretical perspectives on school district decentralization. Education and Urban Society, 7(4), 357-375.

Brademas, J. (1976). Revenue sharing: The national policy debate. Publius: The Journal of Federalism, 6, 155-159.

Brauer, C. M. (1977). John F. Kennedy and the second reconstruction. New York: Columbia University Press.

Brown, D. J. (1990). What is the structure of school-based management? Education Canada, 30(3), 5-9.

Browning, R. S., (Ed.). (1975). From Brown to Bradley: School desegregation 1954-1974. Cincinnati, Ohio: Jefferson Law Book Company.

Burton, W. (1852). The District school as it was, scenery-showing and other writings. Boston: Press of T. R. Marvin.

Butterworth, J. E. (1948). Criteria for a satisfactory administrative unit. In R. T. Gregg (Ed.), Characteristics of Good School Districts. Proceedings of a Conference on School District Organization (pp. 15-18). Madison, WI: School of Education, University of Wisconsin.

Butterworth, J. E. (1948). The place of the intermediate unit in school district organization. Characteristics of Good Schools. Proceedings of a Conference on School District Organization. (Gregg, ed.). Madison, WI: School of Education, University of Wisconsin.

Cairnes, J. E. (1863). The slave power: Character, career and probable designs: Being an attempt to explain the real issues involved in the American contest. London: Macmillan and Co.

Caldwell, O. W., & Courtis, S. A. (1925). Then & now in education 1845:1923: A message of encouragement from the past to the present. New York: Arno Press.

Callahan, R. E. (1962). Education and the cult of efficiency. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Campbell, M. (1927). Rural life at the crossroads. New York: Ginn and Company.

Carlino, G. (1982, May/June). From centralization to deconcentration: Economic activity spreads out. Federal Reserve Bank of Philadelphia, pp. 15-25.

Carlton, F. T. (1965). Economic influences upon educational progress in the United States, 1820-1850. New York: Teachers College Press.

Carr, R. A. (1988). Second-wave reforms crest at local initiative. The School Administrator, 45(7), 16-18.

Carruth, G. (1972). The encyclopedia of American facts and dates. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell.

Carter, J. G. (1969). Letters on the free schools of New England. New York: Arno Press.

Centralisation. (1862). The Edinburgh Review, 115, 323-358.

Centralization. (1850). The United States Magazine and Democratic Review, XXVI(CLII), 289-304.

Chase, F. S. (1948). Advantages and disadvantages of the community administrative unit. In R. T. Gregg, (Ed.) Characteristics of Good School Districts. Proceedings of a Conference on School District Organization (pp. 19-22). Madison, WI: School of Education. University of Wisconsin.

Chase, F. S. (1948). How many children make a school? NEA Journal, 37, 152-153.

Chubb, J. (1987). States' rights and the national interest. Vital Speeches Of The Day, 53, 702-704.

Cibulka, J. G. (1975). School decentralization in Chicago. Education and Urban Society, 7(4), 412-438.

Cillie, F. S. (1940). Centralization or decentralization? A study in educational adaptation. New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University.

Clark, D. L., & Amiot, M. A. (1981). The Reagan administration and federal education policy. Phi Delta Kappan, 63, 258-262.

Clark, D. L., Astuto, T. A. & Rooney, P. M. (1983/84). The changing structure of federal education policy in the 1980s. Phi Delta Kappan, 65, 188-193.

Cocke, W. A. (1871). The Federalist and the U. S. Constitution. Southern Magazine, 8, 77-81.

Coffman, E. M. (1968). The war to end all wars: The American military experience in World War I. New York: Oxford University Press.

Coles, H. L. (1971). The War of 1812. Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press.

Conlan, T. (1988). New federalism: Intergovernmental reform from Nixon to Reagan. Washington, D. C.: The Brookings Institution.

Conant, J. B. (1967). The comprehensive high school: A second report to interested citizens. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company.

Connor, R. D. W., & Poe, C. (1912). The life and speeches of Charles Brantley Aycock. New York: Doubleday, Page and Company.

Consolidation. (1857). The United States Magazine and Democratic Review, 40, 311-314.

Constitutional compromises. (1851). The United States Magazine and Democratic Review, 28(155), 385-393.

Conyers, D. (1984). Decentralization and developments: A review of the literature. Public Administration and Development, 4, 187-197.

Cooper, B. S. (1988). School reform in the 1980s: The new right's legacy. Educational Administration Quarterly, 24(3), 282-298.

Covello, L. (1936). A high school and its immigrant community--a challenge and an opportunity. The Journal of Educational Sociology, 9, 331-346.

Coxe, J. E. (1933). Consolidation of high schools as a program of efficiency and economy. Baton Rouge, LA: The Authors.

Cram, W. A. (1860). The secret of power. The Radical, 4, 17-32.

Credle, W. F. (1940). Speaking for the South. Nation's Schools, 25, 25-29.

Cremin, L. A. (1979). American education: The national experience 1783-1876. New York: Harper & Row, Publishers.

Cronin, J. M. (1973). The control of urban schools; Perspectives on the power of educational reformers. New York: Free Press.

Cuban, L. (1990). Four stories about national goals for American education. Phi Delta Kappan, 72(4), 264-271.

Cubberley, E. P. (1901). The school situation in San Francisco. Educational Review, 21, 364-381.

Culp, D. P. (1971). Transportation and school busing. In The Encyclopedia of Education (Volume 9, pp. 276-278). New York: The Macmillan Company.

Dahl, R. A. (1856). A preface to democratic theory. Chicago, IL: The University Of Chicago Press.

Daniel, W. G. (1940). The aims of secondary education and the adequacy of the curriculum of the negro secondary school. Journal of Negro Education, 9, 465-473.

Daniels, J. (1966). The time between the wars: Armistice to Pearl Harbor. New York: Doubleday & Company, Inc.

Darling-Hammond, L., & Marks, E. L. (1983). The new federalism in education: State responses to the 1981 Education Consolidation and Improvement Act. Washington, D. C.: United States. Department of Education, Government Printing Office.

Davis, H. (1922). Some problems arising in the administration of a department of measurements. Journal of Educational Research, 5, 1-20.

Dentler, R. A., Flowers, C., & Mulvey, K. (1987). Decentralization in the Cleveland public schools. Equity and Excellence, 23, 37-60.

DeWeese, T. H. (1902). Two years' progress in the Chicago public schools. Educational Review, 22, 325-337.

Dewey, J. (1922, December 13). Individuality equality and superiority. The New Republic, pp. 61-63.

Dillon, M. L. (1973). The abolitionists: The growth of a dissenting minority. Dekalb, IL: Northern Illinois University Press.

Dimond, P. R. (1984). Beyond busing: Inside the challenge to urban segregation. Ann Arbor, MI: The University of Michigan Press.

Doran, R. K. (1932). Better rural schools for less cost. School Management, 1, 34-36.

Dozer, D. M. (1947). Anti-imperialism in the United States, 1865-1895. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Cambridge, MA: Harvard University.

Draper, A. S. (1893). Plans of organization for school purposes in large cities. Educational Review, 6, 1-16.

Draper, A. S. (1892). Public school pioneering in New York and Massachusetts. Educational Review, 3, 313-336.

Draper, A. S. (1892). Public school pioneering in New York and Massachusetts: A reply to a reply. Educational Review, 4, 239-252.

Draper, A. S. (1893). Public school pioneering in New York and Massachusetts: A final reply. Educational Review, 5, 345-363.

Du Bois, W. E. B. (1935). Does the negro need a separate school? Journal of Negro Education, 4, 328-335.

Dumond, D. L. (1939). Antislavery origins of the Civil War in the United States. Ann Arbor, MI: The University of Michigan Press.

Dunning, W. A. (1904). Essays on the Civil War and Reconstruction and related topics. New York: The Macmillan Company.

Durant, F. C., III (Ed.). (1981). Between Sputnik and the shuttle: New perspectives on American astronautics. San Diego, CA: American Astronautical Society.

Educational Policies Commission. (1938). The structure and administration of education in American democracy. Washington, D.C.: National Education Association of the United States and the American Association of School Administration.

Eginton, D. P. (1934). Advantages of consolidated schools. Educational Administration and Supervision, 20, 513-526.

Elazar, D. J. (1976). Federalism vs. decentralization: The drift from authenticity. Publius: The Journal of Federalism, 6, 9-19.

Eliot, E. C. (1903). School administration: The St. Louis method. Educational Review, 26, 464-475.

Essert, P. L., & Howard, R. W. (1952). Educational planning by neighborhoods in centralized districts: A research study of the Institute of Adult Education. New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University.

Fainstein, N. I., & Martin, M. (1978). Support for community control among urban elites. Urban Affairs Quarterly, 13(4), 443-468.

Fairlie, J. A. (1898). The centralization of administration in New York state. New York: Columbia University.

Fantini, M. D. (1969). Participation, decentralization, community control and quality education. Teachers College Record, 71(1), 93-107.

Fantini, M., et al. (1970). Community control and the urban school. New York: Praeger.

Fantini, M., & Gittell, M. (1973). Decentralization: Achieving reform. New York: Praeger Publishers.

Featherston, E. G., & Culp, D. P. (1965). Pupil transportation. New York: Harper.

Federalism and home rule in New England, 1800-1815. (1878). The Nation, 26, 11-12.

The Federalist: Letters I through Vi. (1787). Carey's American Museum, 2, 441-533.

Fesler, J. W. (1965). Approaches to the understanding of decentralization. Journal of Politics, 27, 531-566.

Field, D. D. (1881). Centralization in the Federal Government. North American Review, 294, 407-426.

Firestone, W. A. (1990). Succession and bureaucracy: Gouldner revisited. Educational Administration Quarterly, 26(4), 345-375.

Fitzwater, C. O. (1957). School district reorganization: Policies and procedures. Washington, D. C.: Government Printing Office.

Fleming, W. L. (1904). Documents relating to reconstruction. Morgantown, West Virginia: Author.

Foner, P. S. (1972). The Spanish-Cuban-American war and the birth of American imperialism 1895-1902. Volume 1: 1895-1898. New York: Monthly Review Press.

Forsyth, M. (1981). Unions of States: The theory and practice of confederation. New York: Holmes And Meier Publishers.

Frederickson, G., (Ed.). (1973). Neighborhood control in the 1970s: Politics, administration, and citizen participation. New York: Chandler Publishing Company.

Freeman, E. A. (1874). Federalism and home rule. Fortnightly Review, 22, 204-215.

Frost, J. (1852). A history of the United States; For the use of schools and academies. Philadelphia: Thomas, Cowperthwait & Co.

Frymier, J. (1987). Bureaucracy and the neutering of teachers. Phi Delta Kappan, 69, 9-14.

Frymier, J. (1986). Legislating centralization. Phi Delta Kappan, 67, 646-648.

Furtwangler, A. (1984). The authority of Publius A reading of the Federalist Papers. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Galbraith, J. K. (1954). The great crash of 1929. Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin Company.

Garrett, G., & Rothbard, M. N. (1980). The great depression and New Deal monetary policy. San Francisco, CA: Cato Institute.

Gaumitz, W. H. (1935). How small are our schools: small schools--large costs. School Life, 20, 198-233.

Gelfand, L. E., & Neymeyer, R. J. (Eds.). (1985). Changing patterns in American federal-state relations during the 1950s, the 1960s, and the 1970s. Iowa City, Iowa: The University of Iowa.

Gilbert, C. B. (1903). The freedom of the teacher. NEA Add. and Proceedings, 42, 164-177.

Gittell, M. (1977). Critique of the citizen participation movement in education. Journal of Education, 159(1), 7-22.

Gittell, M., & Hollander, T. E. (1968). Six urban school districts: A comparative study of institutional response. New York: Praeger.

Graglia, L. A. (1976). Disaster by decree: The Supreme Court decisions on race and the schools. New York: Cornell University Press.

Graves, F. P. (1932). The administration of America education: With special reference to personnel factors. New York: The Macmillan Company.

Graves, F. P. (1917). A history of education in modern times. New York: The Macmillan Company.

Graves, F. P. (1936). A student's history of education: Our education today in the light of its development. New York: The Macmillan Company.

Green, B. (1976). Administrative decentralization: A premature step beyond community control. Publius: The Journal of Federalism, 6, 141-143.

Green, K. C. (1985). States and the Reagan tax plan. Change, 17, 62.

Gregg, R. T., (Ed.). (1948). Characteristics of good school districts: Proceedings of a conference on school district organization. Madison, WI: School of Education, University of Wisconsin.

Grimshaw, W. (1835). History of the United States from their first settlement as colonies to the period of the fifth census in 1830. Philadelphia: Grigg & Elliott.

Gunning, R. (1984). Confidential ... a challenge to confidential employees. Thrust, 14, 25-26.

Hale, S. (1826). History of the United States from their first settlement as colonies to the close of the war with Great Britain in 1815. New York: Collins and Hannay.

Harder, J. C. (1983). The federal-state relationship: A traditionalist's view. Education And Urban Society, 11, 81-93.

Harrington-Lueker, D. (1990). The engine of reform gathers steam: Kentucky starts from scratch. American School Board Journal, 177, 17-21.

Harris, R. E. (1953). School reorganization. Nation's Schools, 51, 75-76.

Harris, W. T. (1892). City school supervision. Educational Review, 3, 167-172.

Hawkins, R. B. (1976). Administration must not supplant politics in neighborhood government. Publius: The Journal of Federalism, 6, 145-147.

Hayes, A. W. (1921). Rural community organizations. Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press.

Hicks, J. D. (1960). Republican ascendancy, 1921-1933. New York: Harper and Row.

Hinsdale, B. A. (1911). Horace Mann and the common school revival in the United States. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. (Original work published 1898)

Hitsman, J. M. (1965). The Incredible War of 1812: A Military History. Toronto, Canada: University of Toronto Press.

Hobson, E. G. (1918). Educational legislation and administration in the state of New York from 1777 to 1850. Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago.

Hogan, J. C. (1974). The schools, the courts, and the public interest. Lexington, MA: Lexington Books.

Hogwood, B. W., & Peters, B. G. (1985). The pathology of public policy. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Horvath, Mrs. H. (1923). The plea of an immigrant-abstract. National Education Association. Proceedings, (July 1-6), 680-683.

Hovermale, B. (1968). By-lines. Kentucky School Journal, 47, 20.

Hubbert, H. H. (1898). What kind of centralization, if any, will strengthen our local school system? National Education Association. Addresses and Proceedings, 37, 986-989.

Huuhes, W. H. (1934). Do consolidates schools cost more? Nation's Schools, 14, 24.

Humphreys, P. (1952). What are the administrative problems of consolidated schools with grades one to twelve. NASSP Bulletin, 36, 147-153.

Iannaconne, L., & Lutz, F. W. (1970). Politics, power and policy: The governing of local school districts. Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill Publishing Company.

Jackson, S. L. (1941). America's struggle for free schools: Social tension and education in New England and New York, 1827-1842. Washington, D. C.: American Council on Public Affairs.

Jacobson, S. I. (1968). Three variations on a theme: School merger. NEA Journal, 57, 26-28.

Jameson, J. F. (1940). The American revolution considered as a social movement. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Jensen, M. (1948). The articles of confederation: An interpretation of the social-constitutional history of the American Revolution 1774- 1781. Madison, WI: The University Of Wisconsin Press.

Johnson, O. (1881). William Lloyd Garrison and his times; Or, sketches of the anti-slavery movement in American and of the man who was its founder and moral leader. Boston: Houghton, Mifflin and Company.

Kaestle, C. F. (1983). Pillars of the Republic: Common schools and American society 1780-1860. New York: Hill and Wang.

Kalodner, H. I., & Fishman, J. J. (Eds.). (1978). Limits of justice: The courts' rule in school desegregation. Cambridge, MA: Ballinger Publishing Company.

Katz, M. B. (1971). Class, bureaucracy, and schools: The illusion of educational change in America. New York: Praeger.

Katz, M. S. (1976). A history of compulsory education laws. Bloomington, IN: The Phi Delta Kappa Educational Foundation.

The Kentucky-Virginia resolutions and Mr. Madison's report of 1799. (1960). Richmond, VA: The Virginia Commission on Constitutional Government. (Original work published 1799)

Kenyon, C. M. (1966). The Antifederalists. New York: The Bobbs-Merrill Company, Inc.

Kern, O. J. (1906). Phases of modern education: Consolidation of rural schools. Education, 26, 14-26.

Ketz, L. B., (Ed.). (1976). Dictionary of American history. (Volume 2). New York: Charles Scribner's Sons.

Killian, J. R. Jr. (1977). Sputnik, scientists, and Eisenhower: A memoir of the first special assistant to the president for science and technology. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.

Kimball, V. E. (1948). Reorganization of school districts. In R. T. Gregg (Ed.), Characteristics of Good School Districts. Proceedings of a Conference on School District Organization (pp. 36-40). Madison, WI: School of Education. University of Wisconsin.

Kirp, D. L., & Jensen, D. N. (1983). The new federalism goes to court. Phi Delta Kappan, 65, 206-210.

Kolko, G. (1969). The roots of American foreign policy: An analysis of power and purpose. Boston: Beacon Press.

Kolko, G. (1962). Wealth and power in America: An analysis of social class and income distribution. London: Thames and Hudson.

Kolko, J., & Kolko, G. (1972). The limits of power: The world and United States foreign policy, 1945-1954. New York: Harper & Row, Publishers.

Lamm, R. D. (1988). The brave new world of federalism. Applied Research and Public Policy, 3, 16-18.

La Noue, G. R., & Smith, B. L. R. (1973). The politics of school decentralization. Lexington, MA: Lexington Books.

Lawrence, E. A. (1841). On the elementary principles of constitutional law as a branch of education in common schools. American Institute of Instruction. Annual Meeting, 1841, 180-194.

Lee, R. H. (1787). Observations leading to a fair examination of the; system of government proposed by the late convention; and several essential and necessary alterations in to. In a number of letters from the Federal farmer to the Republican. New York: The Farmer?

Lee, R. H. (1962). An additional number of letters from the Federal Farmer to the Republican leading to a fair examination of the system of government, proposed by the late convention; to several essential and necessary alterations in it; and calculated to illustrate and support the principles and positions laid down in the preceding letters [together with] observations on the new constitution, and on the federal and state conventions by a Columbian patriot. Chicago, IL: Americana Classics Quadrangle Books, Inc. (Original work published 1788)

Lemmons, H. C., & Rayner, P. G. (1976, December 16). History of old schools in South Grant. Colfax Chronicle, p. 11.

Levin, B., & Cohen, M. A. (1973). Levels of state aid related to state restrictions on local school district decision-making. Washington, D. C.: The Urban Institute.

Levin, B., & Hawley, W. D. (Eds.). (1977). The courts, social science, and school deseqregation. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Books.

Levin, H. M. (Ed.). (1970). Community control of schools. Washington, D. C.: The Brookings Institution.

Lewis, A. (1964). Portrait of a decade: The second American Revolution. New York: Random House.

Lewis, J. D. (1967). Anti-federalists versus Federalists. San Francisco, CA: Chandler Publishing Company.

Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, E. G. (1985). Naturalistic Inquiry. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.

Lofgren, C. A. (1987). The Plessy case: A legal-historical interpretation. New York: Oxford University Press.

Loring, E. G. (184?). The drift toward centralization. The North American Review, 139, 155-163.

Luce, C. B. (1958). Little Rock ad the muscovite moon. In R. Witkin (Ed.), The Challenge of the Sputniks (pp. 17-19). New York: Doubleday, pp. 17-19.

Lyke, R. F. (1970). Political issues in school decentralization. In M. W. Kirst (Ed.), The Politics of Education At the Local, State and Federal Levels (pp. 111-132). Berkeley, CA: McCutchan.

Mace, G. (1979). Locke, Hobbes, and the Federalist Papers: An essay on the genesis of American political heritage. Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press.

Magill, F. N., & Loos, J. L. (Eds.). (1975). Great events from history. (Vols. 1-3). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Salem Press.

Maier, P. (1986). The American people: A history. Lexington, MA: D. C. Heath and Company.

Mandel, D. R. (1983). ECIA CHAPTER 2: Education's first taste of the New Federalism. Education and Urban Society, 16(1), 29-43.

Mann, H. (1849). The Massachusetts common schools: Being an enlarged and revised edition of the tenth annual report of the first secretary of the Massachusetts Board of Education. Boston: Dutton and Wentworth, State Printers.

Marble, A. P. (1894). City school administration. Educational Review, 8, 154-168.

Margolis, L. (1976). Issues of fiscal federalism are too important to be decided by the national government alone. Publius: The Journal of Federalism, 6, 161-167.

Martin, G. H. (1894). The evolution of the Massachusetts public school system: A historical sketch. New York: D. Appleton and Company.

Martin, G. H. (1892). Public school pioneering. Educational Review, 4, 35-46.

Martin, G. H. (1893). Public school pioneering: Final statement of the Massachusetts claim. Educational Review, 5, 232-242.

Massachusetts Board of Education. (1849). The Massachusetts common schools; Being an enlarged and revised edition of the tenth annual report of the first secretary of the Massachusetts Board of Education. Boston: Dutton and Wentworth, State Printers.

Maxcy, S. J. (1976). The idea of consolidation in southern education during the early decades of the twentieth century. Peabody Journal of Education, 74, 216-222.

Maxwell, W. H. (1894). Professor Hinsdale on the city school superintendent. Educational Review, 7, 186-188.

McGinn, N., & Street, S. (1986). Educational decentralization: weak state or strong state. Comparative Education Review, 30(4), 471-490.

McKitrick, E. L. (1963). Slavery defended: The views of the old south. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

McLure, W. P. (1956). The intermediate administrative school district in the United States. Urbana, IL: Bureau of Educational Research, College of Education, University of Illinois.

McSwine, B. L. (1974). The need for community control in education. Black Scholar, 6(4), 9-15.

Merritt, R. L., & Merritt, A. J. (Eds.). (1985). Innovation in the public sector. London: Sage Publications.

Meyer, H. N. (1973). The amendment that refused to die. Radnor, PA: Chilton Book Company.

Mills, W. (1935). Road to war: America 1914-1917. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company.

Monroe, P. (1940). Founding of the American public school system: History of education in the United States; From the early settlements to the close of the Civil War period. New York: The Macmillan Company.

Morgan, E. P. (1982). The effects of proposition 21/2 in Massachusetts. Phi Delta Kappan, 64(4), 252-258.

Morison, S. E. (1956). The intellectual life of Colonial New England. New York: New York University Press.

Mort, P. R. (1941). American schools in transition: How our schools adapt their practices to changing needs, A study of Pennsylvania. New York: Teachers College, Columbia University.

Mort, P. R. (1936). Federal support for public education: A report of an investigation of educational need and relative ability of states to support education as they bear on federal aid to education. New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia College.

Mort, P. R. (1934). Local initiative and educational progress. Teachers College Record, 35(5), 573-579.

Mort, P. R. (1933). State support for public education. Washington, D. C.: The American Council on Education.

Moss, J. A., & Howland, H. S. (1920). America in battle: With guide to the American battlefields in France and Belgium. Menasha, WI: George Banta Publishing Co.

Mowry, D. (1900). The Milwaukee school system. Educational Review, 20, 141-151.

Mowry, W. A. (1895). Powers and duties of school superintendents. Educational Review, 9, 38-51.

Mudd, J. (1976). Beyond community control: A neighborhood strategy for city government. Publius: The Journal of Federalism, 6, 113-135.

Mullins, C. (1973). School district consolidation: Odds are 2 to 1 it'll get you. American School Board Journal, 160, 23-27, 57.

Murphy, J. T. (1989). The paradox of decentralizing schools: Lessons from business, government and the Catholic church. Phi Delta Kappan, 70, 808-812.

Nathan, R. P. (1976). The roots and sprouts of revenue sharing. Publius: The Journal of Federalism, 6, 169-175.

Nearing, S. (1909). The working of a large board of education. Educational Review, 38, 43-51.

Nelson, A. H. (1902). The little red schoolhouse. Educational Review, 23, 304-315.

New England federalism. (1878). The Nation, 26, 11-12.

Olin, S. H. (1894). Public school reform in New York. Educational Review, 8, 1-6.

Orlich, D. C. (1989). Education reforms: mistakes, misconceptions, miscues. Phi Delta Kappan, 71, 512-517.

Ornstein, A. C. (1980). Administrative decentralization and community involvement. Illinois Schools Journal, 59(4), 3-17.

Ornstein, A. C. (1989). Centralization and decentralization of large public school districts. Urban Education, 24(2), 233-235.

Ornstein, A. C. (1984). The changing Federal role in education. American Education, 20, 4-7.

Ornstein, A. C. (1981). Decentralization - is it working? Principal, 61(2), 24-27.

Ornstein, A. C. (1974). Metropolitan schools: Administrative decentralization vs. community control. Metuchen, NJ: Scarecrow Press.

Ornstein, A. C., Levine, D. U., & Wilkerson, D. A. (1975). Reforming metropolitan schools. Pacific Palisades, CA: Goodyear Publishing Company.

Orth, S. P. (1903). The centralization of administration in Ohio. New York: The Columbia University Press.

O'Shea, D. W. (1975). School districts decentralization: The case of Los Angeles. Education and Urban Society, 7(4), 377-392.

Ostrom, V. (1976). The contemporary debate over centralization and decentralization. Publius: The Journal of Federalism, 6, 21-32.

Ostrom, V. (1971). The political theory of a compound republic: A reconstruction of the logical foundations of American democracy as presented in The Federalist. Blacksburg, VA: Public Choice.

Palfrey, J. G. (1858-1890). History of New England. (Vols. 1-5). Boston, MA: Little, Brown And Company.

Perrett, G. (1982). American in the twenties: A History. New York: Simon and Schuster.

Peshkin, A. (1982). The imperfect union: School consolidation and community conflict. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Pierce, N. R. (1991). Chicago school reform - saved but still embattled. Nation's Cities Weekly, 14(35), 8.

Pierce, N. R. (1976). Fiscal federalism: Sharing revenue is not enough. Publius: The Journal of Federalism, 6, 177-184.

Pipho, C. (1988). State and local control: Rainbows and dark clouds. Phi Delta Kappan, 70(1), 6-7.

Pilo, M. R. (1975). A tale of two cities: The application models of school decentralization to the cases of New York City and Detroit. Education and Urban Society, 7(4), 393-411.

Poe, C. (1963). My first 80 years. Chapel Hill, NC: The University of North Carolina Press.

Prince, J. T. (1904). The evolution of school supervision. Educational Review, 22, 148-161.

Porter, D. O., & Olsen, E. A. (1976). Some critical issues in government centralization and decentralization. Public Administration Review, 36, 72-84.

Punke, C. (1968, September 8). Ascension parish children schooling since 1812--claim. The Times-Picayune, p. 1.

Punke, H. H. (1945). Consolidation builds morale. School Executive, 64, 47-49.

Quesada, G. de, & Northrop, H. D. (1898). Cuba's great struggle for freedom containing a complete record of Spanish tyranny and oppression scenes of violence and bloodshead .... Washington, D. C.: The Authors.

Rabe, B. G. (1986). Commentary: The difficulties of "decentralizing." Research In Urban Policy, 2, 93-94.

Rabe, B. G. (1988). Toward the next federalism. Applied Research And Public Policy, 3, 5-15.

A rallying point for all true friends to their country. (1800). Charleston, SC: n. p.

Raschert, J. (1987). Changing schools into intercultural agencies. Zeitschrift-fur-Pedagogik, 33(6), 841-860.

Rawles, W. A. (1903). Centralizing tendencies in the administration of Indiana. New York: The Columbia University Press.

Reagan, M. D. (1985). Federal-state relations during the 1960s: Unplanned change. In L. E. Gelfand & R. J. Neymeyer (Eds.). Changing Patterns In American Federal-State Relations During The 1960s And The 1970s (pp. 31-48). Iowa City, IA: The University of Iowa.

Reagan, M. D., & Sanzone, J. G. (1981). The new federalism. New York: Oxford University Press.

Reilly, D. H. (1987). Centralization and control: Values and quality of education. Education, 107(4), 388-393.

Richardson, E. L. (1976). Dialogues on decentralization: An introduction. Publius: The Journal of Federalism, 6, 1-6.

Ripley, C. P. (1985). The black abolitionist papers. (Volumes 1-2). Chapel Hill, NC: The University of North Carolina Press.

Rist, M. C. (1990). Chicago decentralizes. American School Board Journal, 177, 21-24, 36.

Rist, R. C., & Anson, R. J. (Eds.). (1977). Education, social science, and the judicial process. New York: Teachers College Press.

Rogers, D. (1982). School decentralization: It works. Social Policy, 12(4), 13-23.

Rozwenc, E. C. (1949). Slavery as a cause of the Civil War. Boston, MA: D. C. Heath and Company.

Sandiford, P. (1928). Comparative education: Studies of the educational systems of six modern nations. New York: E. P. Dutton & Co.

Sargent, P. (1943). War and education. Boston, MA: Porter Sargent.

Scanland, A. L. (1869). The secret of power. The Western Monthly, 1(6), 357-361.

Schimmel, D., & Fischer, L. (1987). Parents, schools and the law. Columbia, MD: The National Committee for Citizens in Education.

School progress in Washington. (1937). Nation's Schools, 19, 30.

Seybolt, R. F. (1969). The public schools of colonial Boston, 1635-1775. New York: Arno Press.

Shimahara, N. K. (1986). Japanese education reforms in the 1980s. Issues in Education, 4(2), 85-100.

Simpson, J. A., Weiner, E. S. C. (Preps.). (1989). The Oxford English dictionary. (Vols. 1-20). (2nd ed.). Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Skidmore, C. H. (1938). Progress follows consolidation. Nation's Schools, 22, 14-18.

Skotheim, R. A. (1966). American intellectual histories and historians. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Smith, B. S. (1985). Decentralization: The territorial dimension of the state. London: George Allen & Unwin.

Smith, B. S. (1985). Decentralization: The territorial dimension of state. London: George Allen & Unwin.

Smith, D. T., & DeYoung, A. J. (1988). Big school vs. small school: Conceptual, empirical, and political perspectives on the re-emerging debate. Journal of Rural And Small Schools, 2(2), 2-11.

Snider, W. (1990). Chicago councils begin to decide fate of principals: 49 school panels vote not to retain leaders. Education Week, IX(25), 1, 13.

Stone, D. A. (1988). Policy paradox and political reason. Boston: Scott, Foresman and Company.

Stowe, H. B. (1852). Uncle Tom's cabin. London: John Cassell, Ludgate Hill.

Strayer, G. D. (1934). The ability and the obligation of the state to support education. Teachers College Record, 35(5), 580-591.

Strayer, G. D., & Thorndike, E. L. (1922). Educational administration: quantitative studies. New York: The Macmillan Company.

Strayer, G. D. (1911). The Baltimore school situation. Educational Review, 42, 325-345.

Talmage, H., & Ornstein, A. C. (1976). School superintendents' attitudes toward community participation. Educational Research Quarterly, 1(2), 37-45.

Taylor, R. (1879) Destruction and reconstruction: Personal experiences of the late war. New York: D. Appleton and Company.

Thomas, J. L. (1965). Slavery attacked: The abolitionist crusade. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Thompson, D. (1966). History of the late war between Great Britain and the United States of America: With a retrospective view of the causes from whence it originated. Collected from the most authentic sources. To which is added an appendix, containing public documents &c., relating to the subject. Niagara, U. C.: T. Sewell, Johnson Reprint Corporation. (Original work published 1832)

Thornburgh, D. (1988). Challenges facing state and local government. Applied Research And Public Policy, 3, 19-21.

Thwing, C. F. (1898). A new profession. Educational Review, 15, 26-33.

Thursfield, R. E. (1945). Henry Barnard's American Journal of Education. Baltimore, MD: The Johns Hopkins Press.

Tucker, G. (1954). Poltroons and patriots: A popular account of the War of 1812. (Vols. 1-2). New York: The Bobbs-Merrill Company, Inc.

Tyack, D. (1974). The one best system. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

United States. Congress. House of Representatives. Committee on Education and Labor. (1984). A compilation of federal education laws: Volume 1--general provisions as amended through December 31, 1984. Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office.

United States. Congress. House of Representatives. Committee on Education and Labor. (1984). A compilation of federal education laws: Volume II--elementary and secondary education, education of the handicapped, and related programs as amended through December 31, 1984. Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office.

United States. Congress. House of Representatives. House Committee on Education and Labor. Senate Committee on Human Resources. (1977). A compilation of federal education laws as amended through June 30, 1977. Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office.

United States. Department of Commerce. Bureau of the Census. (1975). Historical statistics of the United States: Colonial times to the 1970. Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office.

United States. Department of Commerce. Bureau of the Census. (1913-1990). Statistical Abstract of the United States. Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office.

Walker, D. (1976). The prospects for administrative decentralization in our cities. Publius: The Journal of Federalism, 6, 137-139.

Warren, E. (1959). The public papers of Chief Justice Earl Warren. New York: Simon and Schuster.

Webster, W. C. (1897). Recent centralizing tendencies in state educational administration. New York: Columbia University.

Weiler, H. N. (1985). Politics of educational reform. In R. L. Merritt & A. J. Merritt (Eds.). Innovation In The Public Sector. London: Sage Publications.

Wetmore, S. A. (1897). Boston school administration. Educational Review, 14, 105-117.

Whipple, E. P. (Ed.). (1880). Great speeches and orations of Daniel Webster. Boston: Little, Brown.

Williams, T. H. (1952). Lincoln and his generals. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.

Wilson, H. (1872). History of the rise and fall of the slave power in America. (Volumes 1-III). Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company.

Winn, I. J. (1990). States' rights, states' responsibilities, and the ghost of Calhoun. Social Education, 54(7), 455-457.

Winter, W. F. (1988). Federalism in a time of austerity. Applied Research And Public Policy, 3, 22-24.

Wissler, D. F., & Ortiz, F. I. (1986). The decentralization process of school systems: A review of the literature. Urban Education, 21(3), 280-294.

Witkin, R., (Ed.). (1958). The challenge of the Sputniks. New York: Doubleday.

Wood, F. G. (1975). The era of Reconstruction, 1863-1877. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Company.

Woody, T. (1969). Quaker education in the colony and state of New Jersey. New York: Arno Press.

Zimet, M. (1973). Decentralization and school effectiveness. A case study of the 1969 decentralization law in New York City. New York: Teacher's College, Columbia University.

APPENDIX A

Bibliographic Sources

Citation Analysis by Index or Database
Centralization or Decentralization: General and Education

Index or Database	General	Education
ABC PolSci Index	184	n/a
America: History and Life	600	114
Books in Print	124	23
ERIC, including *CIJE *RIE	2555	2119
Dissertation Abstracts International	1380	508
GPO Monthly	21	5
Historical Abstracts	1379	79
Legal Resources Index	63	6
Infotrak	812	
Poole's Index to Periodical Literature	11	n/a
Wilsonline	n/a	124

*CIJE - Current Index to Journals in Education

*RIE - Resources in Education

APPENDIX B

Sample Programs and Output

```
;-------------------------------------------------------------------------------;
;  SUBJ   = A          VOPG   = E          TYPE   = I                = M       ;
;  AUTH   = B          ABST   = F          BDJO   = J                = N       ;
;  TITL   = C          YEAR   = G          AREA   = K                = O       ;
;  JOUR   = D          PPLD   = H                 = L                = P       ;
;-------------------------------------------------------------------------------;
;  FORMAT #.. 2                                                                 ;
;  LABEL..... SUBJECT INDEX                                                     ;
;  HEAD [1].. @P1 @BB A @EB                                                     ;
;  BODY...... @P1 @T3 B " " @BI C @EI " " @BU D @EU " " E " " H " " @Fx      + ;
;  BODY......                                                                + ;
;  HEAD [2]..                                                                + ;
;  BODY......                                                                + ;
;  BODY......                                                                + ;
;  HEAD [3]..                                                                + ;
;  BODY......                                                                + ;
;  BODY......                                                                + ;
;  SELECT.... ALL                                                               ;
;  TYPE...... 9                                                                 ;
;-------------------------------------------------------------------------------;
;                                                                               ;
;  Do you want to change these parameters? (Y/N) )                              ;
;                                                                               ;
;-------------------------------------------------------------------------------(
```

```
SUBJ    = A          VORG    = E          TYPE    = I                = M
AUTH    = B          ABST    = F          BDJO    = J                = N
TITL    = C          YEAR    = G          AREA    = K                = O
JOUR    = D          PPLD    = H                  = L                = P

FORMAT #.. 1
LABEL..... YEAR
HEAD [1].. @P1 @BB G @EB
BODY...... @P1 @T3 B " " @BI C @EI " " @BU D @EU " " E " " H " " @Fx      +
BODY......                                                               +
HEAD [2]..                                                               +
BODY......                                                               +
BODY......                                                               +
HEAD [3]..                                                               +
BODY......                                                               +
BODY......                                                               +
SELECT.... ALL
TYPE...... 9

Do you want to change these parameters? (Y/N) )
```

1965

Williams, Oliver P. *Suburban Differences And Metropolitan Policies: A Philadelphia Story.* London: Oxford University, 1965.

1971

Webster, William E. *Decentralization: An Evolving Process in Local Government.* Washington, D. C.: Washington Center For Metropolitan Studies, 1971.

1972

Thornhill, W., ed. *The Case For Regional Reform: With Extracts From Essential Documents.* London: Nelson, 1972.

Willmott, Peter, ed. *Local Government Decentralization And Community.* London: Policy Studies Institute, 1987.

Welker, Walter F. *Decentralizing Government In Modernizing Nations: Growth Center Ptential Of Turkish Provincial Cities.* Sage Publications, 1972.

United States. Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations. *The New Grass Roots Government? Decentralization and Citizen Participation.* Washington, D. C,: Government Printing Office, 1972.

Citizens Budget Commission, Inc. *Decentralization In the New York City Department Of Sanitation: A Case Study in Administrative Reorganization.* New York:

Duisin, Zenta W. *Decentralization in Urban Government: An Annotated Bibliography.* Monticello, Illinois: Council of Planning Librarians, 1972.

New York, NY. Office of the Press, Borough of Manhattan. *A Plan For Localized Government For New York City.* New York, NY: The Office, 1972.

Zambia Cabinet Office. *Report Of The Working Party Appointed To Review The System Of Decentralized Administration.* Lusaka, Zambia: The Cabinet Office, 1972.

VITA

Charles Walter Triche III was born in Napoleonville, Louisiana on August 7, 1948 to Charles Walter Triche Jr. and Virginia Ann Politz. He is the oldest of three sons. He attended St. Gerard Majella Catholic School and graduated from Redemptorist Diocesan Senior High School in 1966. He holds a Bachelor of Science degree in Secondary Education as well as a Master of Science degree in Library and Information Science. He has held positions in the libraries at Louisiana State University, Clemson University and is currently Head of Circulation Services and Associate Professor of Library Science in the Edith Garland Dupre Library at the University of Southwestern Louisiana. He is the author of over thirty publications including fifteen books and is currently a candidate for the Doctor of Philosophy degree.

DOCTORAL EXAMINATION AND DISSERTATION REPORT

Candidate: Charles Walter Triche III

Major Field: Education

Title of Dissertation: Changing Patterns of Centralization and Decentralization in American School Governance

Approved:

Gary M. Crow
Major Professor and Chairman

Daniel Fogel
Dean of the Graduate School

EXAMINING COMMITTEE:

M. Blato

Terry L. Seiler

Evangeline McJamerson

Charles Riddle

Anne Landrum

Vaughan B. Baker

Christopher Kenney

Date of Examination:

2/26/92